

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The Teaching Of Drama In Secondary Schools: How Cambridgeshire Teachers Feel The Subject Should Be Taught In Relationship To The National Curriculum

Thesis

How to cite:

Radley, Kathleen Elizabeth (2002). The Teaching Of Drama In Secondary Schools: How Cambridgeshire Teachers Feel The Subject Should Be Taught In Relationship To The National Curriculum. EdD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2002 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21954/ou.ro.0000497a>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Kathleen Elizabeth Radley

K0058818

The Teaching of Drama in Secondary Schools: How
Cambridgeshire teachers feel the subject should be
taught in relationship to the National Curriculum.

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (EdD)

2002

Contents

Abstract	iii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review	23
Chapter Three: Methodology	61
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion	96
Chapter Five: Conclusion	150
Appendices	158
References	193

Abstract

This research aims to explore teachers' views and beliefs with regard to drama as they attempt to define their subject and discuss its content. It examines the debates of the major theorists for drama, including Heathcote and Hornbrook, and considers the views and beliefs of teachers in the field to see which models of learning are reflected in their teaching. Teachers are required to teach drama to English National Curriculum objectives at Key Stage Three, where drama is not regarded as a discrete subject, but is subsumed under English Attainment Target One, 'Speaking and Listening'. At Key Stage Four, drama is regarded as a separate subject from English, where it is taught according to specific Drama GCSE syllabuses. The question is whether teachers' beliefs about the content, learning and assessment of drama complement the National Curriculum objectives in Key Stages Three and Four. Consequently, further investigation is carried out with regard to which orientation to content, learning and assessment is reflected by the National Curriculum. Teachers' beliefs concerning subject content, learning and assessment are considered generally as well as with explicit regard to drama teaching itself, to see whether there is a mismatch between the views embodied by the major theorists, teachers' beliefs and the National Curriculum.

Figures and Appendices

Before and After The National Curriculum	Fig 1:1	5
Models of Learning	Fig 2:1	25
Participants, Settings and Materials	Fig 3:1	64
Results of Questionnaire Pilot (Section A)	Fig 3:2	74
Results of Questionnaire Pilot (Section B)	Fig 3:3	75
Results of Questionnaire Pilot (Section C)	Fig 3:4	76
Summary Information on Participants in Interviews	Fig 3:5	93
Results of Questionnaire (Section A)	Fig 4:1	98
Results of Questionnaire (Section B)	Fig 4:2	99
Results of Questionnaire (Section C)	Fig 4:3	100
Examination Boards' Assessment structure	Appendix One	159
English National Curriculum (AT1)	Appendix Two	160
Interview Questions (Pilot)	Appendix Three	164
Changes made to Questionnaire	Appendix Four	165
Glossary of Terms	Appendix Five	166
Results of Interview pilot	Appendix Six	167
Supplementary information for Questionnaire	Appendix Seven	169
Questionnaire (Pilot)	Appendix Eight	170
Letter to schools	Appendix Nine	173
Interview Questions	Appendix Ten	174
Drama GCSE Syllabus	Appendix Eleven	175

1. INTRODUCTION

This research into drama education has been conducted partly through personal interest and partly through professional interest. In the past fourteen years, I have stood on both sides of the fence. From the first stages of my career when I was a probationer teaching English (and was given GCSE drama classes to teach with absolutely no drama training at all) through to being Head of the English and Expressive Arts faculty in a large comprehensive. Influences on attitude can be responsibility, accountability and management position in the professional hierarchy. As a teacher of drama and as a teacher-in-charge of drama, I argued for a discrete subject, a less structured programme of study and for assessment to be based on effort and cooperation. When I was responsible for five arts departments including English and had to produce coordinated whole faculty schemes of work and assessment policies I argued with reluctant Heads of Department for a team approach and standardized policies based on the National Curriculum, which could be included in a faculty handbook required for an imminent OFSTED inspection. In the first case, I was looking for what was unique to drama. In the second, I was looking for similarities to and congruence with English and other arts subjects. On the journey between these two viewpoints were all possible shades of grey.

What the content of drama comprises is central to this investigation. Does drama have a distinct content of its own? Is it a branch of English or is its function that of a teaching tool which services the rest of the curriculum? The content of drama should inform how it is taught and how it is learnt. Teachers have to be clear about what they are teaching before they can devise strategies for teaching it. Equally, it follows that they have to know the content for assessment purposes.

Two ongoing debates relate directly to the issue of the content of drama instruction. They are:

1. The Drama/Theatre debate, i.e. are drama and theatre two separate subjects, with different skills and knowledge, or are they aspects of the

same experience? If drama is a separate art form, should technical theatre skills, such as lighting and set design, be taught as part of a drama lesson?

2. The process/product debate, i.e. should the assessment focus be on all the stages of the dramatic learning process, through each of the planning stages, including assessment of students' negotiating and interactional skills and their abilities to solve problems and find solutions, or should the assessment focus be on a polished and final end product?

These two debates are inextricably linked, as the concept of working towards and being assessed on an 'end product' obviously indicates a relationship with theatre, which presents a polished performance to a public audience, rather than with the drama process which has more to do with problem solving and exploration of life situations for the individuals concerned.

Such questions may have been constantly under discussion within the confines of drama as a discrete subject but the National Curriculum says that, until Key Stage Four, drama is part of the English curriculum and it provides objectives and examples of its own suitable activities, accordingly. However, it is not clear what practicing teachers feel about these issues. Teachers' perspectives are needed on these concerns to discover whether teachers share some uncertainty over the current role of drama teaching and whether there is a match between how teachers feel drama should be taught and what the National Curriculum says.

From being an offshoot of English, drama now enjoys its own status as a distinct subject timetabled in its own right, a separate qualification at GCSE and a foundation for progression into post 16 education either in A level Performing Arts, A level Drama, A level Theatre Studies, or as part of GNVQ Performing Arts. In fact, drama can be tested as a discrete subject at GCSE, even though it does not stand as a separate course within the National Curriculum at Key Stage Three (for 11-14 year olds). As a result of this development, by the early 1990s there was the possibility of confusion in teachers' minds as to the position of drama in schools. Through this research it may be possible to determine which theoretical

perspective on learning the National Curriculum Attainment Target One *Speaking and Listening* represents. This is where drama is currently located in the curriculum (at Key Stage Three). However, the teaching of drama has changed over the years. Therefore, before investigating the perspectives of current drama teachers, I will aim to provide pertinent historical information on the teaching of drama. This will help explain how diverging views on the nature of drama instruction and its assessment have emerged over time.

The History of Drama Teaching in England and Wales

In the last thirty years, the teaching and assessment of drama have changed significantly. Until the end of the 1980s, assessment in drama was largely based on practical work; grades were awarded for class work in the form of continuous assessment marks for spontaneous and polished improvisations. At GCSE, there was also a final practical examination, which tested these skills under controlled conditions in the presence of an external moderator. As a result, it was acceptable for a pupil to gain the top grades at GCSE (A-C) by being examined purely in the practical area. Although a working notebook was usually kept, along with research notes for various projects, literary skills were not taken into account in assessing a pupil. Drama was clearly regarded as a practical subject and, as a result, its nature and purpose were made evident to teachers. The Gulbenkian Report (1982) had earlier endorsed the notion that the arts are amenable to judgements based on “subjective agreement” and sought to validate “intuitive judgement” (Gulbenkian Report, 1982, p. 27) as legitimate evaluation for practical work in the arts in schools.

Before the changes which are now occurring in drama, lessons had involved some written work, perhaps critical reflection of pupils’ own or others’ work, note taking or script-writing for prepared improvisation. However, emphasis in assessment was not on literary skills but content. The written work was there to inform the process of the drama. This again suggested for teachers of drama that their subject had separate core skills and knowledge from English.

Assessment was primarily formative, based on activity and process, and was part of the learning cycle that contributed to pupils' future learning. The exception to this was the summative assessment used for grading GCSE students at the end of their course. However, this grade was in addition to the continuous assessment grades gained over the two years and was still practical in nature.

Following the pattern in other subjects determined by central government legislation, there has now been a shift in emphasis away from practical coursework in drama. Some coursework remains but a written component has been introduced to most GCSE syllabuses, either in the form of a coursework folder or a written examination. The Qualifications and Curriculum and Authority now require a practical worth 60%-80% of the final grade and a written paper of 40%-20%. It was once possible to follow a syllabus, which offered 100% practical coursework. The rationale for change would seem to be as part of the government's establishment of a centralised system of assessment for the purpose of making schools more accountable. What began as a formative approach to provide helpful feedback about individuals' progress has become a summative means of evaluating school and LEA performance by means of aggregated data. (Gipps and Stobart, 1993).

There are four main examination boards in England. The assessment components of these boards are provided in Appendix One. It can be seen from this data that all the main syllabuses have a written component. It is also possible to be assessed purely on design and technical skills. There is a move towards theatre skills as part of the syllabuses.

Figure 1.1: *Summary Chart: Before and After The National Curriculum*

<u>Before the National Curriculum</u>	<u>After the National Curriculum</u>
The teaching and assessment focus in drama was on practical work. GCSE work could be entirely practical	The teaching and assessment focus in drama is on both practical and written work. GCSE work cannot be entirely practical.
Assessment focus was both continuous and formative. GCSE contained mainly formative but some summative assessment.	Assessment focus has moved towards the summative GCSE contains mainly summative but some formative assessment.
Subjective and intuitive judgements by the teacher were acceptable for assessment purposes.	Teacher assessment must be substantiated by written evidence.
Literary skills were not included	Written component in all GCSE syllabuses.
Move away from theatre skills.	Move towards theatre skills. Students can be assessed purely in design and technical skills at GCSE

It is evident that there are several different views about how drama should be taught and assessed. Before the introduction of the National Curriculum, the prevailing orthodoxy was the Drama-In-Education theories of Heathcote which influenced drama teaching and assessment throughout the 1970s and 1980s. However, this was not the only voice in the field. Heathcote has her critics, the most prominent of whom is Hornbrook (1989). The National Curriculum too presents a different orientation for drama. Given the apparent divergence of opinion on the nature of drama instruction, it may be helpful to look at the key theorists in the field of drama instruction. Their writings may help to clarify the nature of drama instruction, including its definition, its teaching and its assessment. Consequently, in the following

section, I explore the views of key contributors to the field of drama instruction.

The Perspectives of Drama Theorists: What is Drama and How Should it be Taught?

In this section, I will explore the views of key figures in the field of drama instruction. For each individual I will discuss his or her view on: the definition of drama, content of instruction, theatre/drama debate, process/product debate, and the assessment of drama. I will then summarize their similarities and differences.

HEATHCOTE

The prevailing orthodoxy of the fifties followed Slade's (1954) view of drama as 'play' and in the 1960s followed Way's (1967) view of drama as 'life skills.' The idea of both of these theorists was that drama is concerned with the individual and self-expression. Thus began the separation of drama from Theatre. Dorothy Heathcote changed the face of drama in the 1970s and 1980s, as she regarded drama both as a group activity and to do with the pursuit of knowledge. To this end, she pioneered the idea of Teacher-In-Role.

Heathcote regards drama as "The study of how meanings are revealed and made explicit in a moment by moment experience of life" (Johnson and O'Neill, 1984, p. 31). She talks about how in drama we reflect upon nature, people's affairs and behaviour. Drama is seen as a process whereby students can use knowledge, not as a point of reference as something out there to be copied, but as a source of understanding to be analysed and questioned. Drama is thus social and fuels a curiosity about the world, its inhabitants and one's own feelings towards it. It uses the conditions of humanity and stresses the importance of reflection.

Drama is also regarded as an art form and Heathcote (Johnson and O'Neill, 1984) actually argues for treating the students as artists in a drama lesson. Drama, like the other arts, is there to make people see the world afresh.

Drama is also action, but participants in drama do not take part in 'acting'

“There is never any acting involved. It is more a matter of taking up an attitude, a way of looking at a situation and being involved in it. (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984, p.72)

The important point is that drama brings about a change in the students who participate.

The content of instruction for Heathcote was social. This extremely wide definition of content is best summed up by her contention, often repeated, that she regarded herself as primarily a teacher and secondarily a teacher of drama. A teacher is simply one who creates learning situations for others.

“Her aim is to build on her pupils’ past experience and give them a deeper knowledge not just of themselves but of what it is to be human as well as an understanding of the society they live in and its past present and future.”
(Johnson and O’Neill 1984, p. 12)

Heathcote speaks of the master/apprentice relationship when the teacher is constantly intervening “struggling to set up shared experiences with her pupils” (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984, p. 9). Negotiation is important here and she talks about the problem solving approach. Learning is the product of this teacher intervention.

It is somewhat ironic that the person who has done the most to preserve the drama/theatre divide speaks in favour of theatre in the classroom situation. Heathcote would claim that

“Theatre understanding is most necessary in classroom practice, but not the elaborate game element of showing, which professional theatre must employ” (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984, p. 31).

The idea being that teachers must understand the cause and effect of theatrical elements, such as how tension is created, so that they “learn how to employ the magic” (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984 p. 32). But this is for the enhanced experience of the people in the drama not for people watching.

This is employing the term ‘theatre’ in a slightly different way from the understanding of ‘theatre’ as a public performance. It is more that the participants are showing an

“understanding of the basic elements which drama and theatre share, a grasp of how tension, sign and symbol operate in drama.” (Johnson and O’Neill 1984, p. 13)

This definition of ‘theatre’ does not include technical skills such as lighting and set design.

Heathcote’s view on the process/product debate is closely linked with the theatre/drama debate; the whole learning emphasis is on the process. It is this heavy focus on the process, which has so influenced Drama instruction throughout the 1970s and 1980s. The idea of ‘process’ is an important one. New learning in the drama classroom is not built upon prior knowledge or changing prior knowledge structures to deal with new situations but is built upon internalisation by the student of the shared cognitive processes enabling the student to extend existing knowledge and skills. So, as Heathcote (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984) would argue, the end product of improvisation is the experience of that situation which has brought about some change in the participant.

Assessment

Heathcote does not concern herself with formal assessment of drama. She does however, lay stress on reflection:

“The getting of an ‘education’ is really the widening of our areas of reference in meaningful ways, so that our reflective powers and our attitudes became more and more significant to us, and to those concerned with us.”
(Johnson and O’Neill, 1984, p. 32)

Much of the assessment of the process based, continuous assessment syllabuses of the 1980s marked students on their ability to reflect upon and evaluate their work.

“The dropping of the particular into the universal is the digestion process of the arts, which creates the opportunity for reflection, which is what education is all about.”
(Johnson and O’Neill, 1984, p. 35)

This reflection helps bring about the change that is necessary for successful drama. Heathcote’s approach outlined above is known as Drama-In-Education and sometimes referred to here and elsewhere as DIE.

BOLTON

A former lecturer in Drama-In-Education, Gavin Bolton has written extensively on education in schools and contributed to INSET courses for local education authorities in England. Although he would be considered as part of the Heathcote school of thought, and is a relatively minor figure compared with Heathcote he does combine some of the child’s play ideas of Slade (1954) and some elements of theatre with the Drama-In-Education theories of Heathcote.

Bolton, along with Heathcote, perceives drama as an art form and also sees one of the main aims of drama as being personal growth and a means of social development. Bolton (1979) describes how drama explores the world at a metaphorical level. His claim is that “It uses the form of being in order to explore being.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 22). This is the physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations that is considered dramatic activity. He also follows Heathcote in the idea that knowledge is created.

“It is thought-in-action, its purpose is the creation of meaning; its medium is the interaction between two concrete contexts.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 21)

Bolton would also claim, along with Heathcote, that Drama involves change. “Drama is concerned with a change of insight.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 41). The core of Bolton’s belief about drama is found in the following statement

“Drama-in-Education is primarily concerned with change in appraisal, an affective/cognitive development.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 38)

This change in appraisal is a change in judgement or change in viewpoint brought about by participation in the drama. Drama is always viewed as being concerned with the social and is generally a group activity.

Bolton is an advocate of the Teacher-In-Role methods of Heathcote, working alongside the students in a problem-solving situation.

“It is one of the principal functions of a teacher in ... drama to help the participants work towards meanings beyond the literal.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 84)

The aim is personal development and the content is again, non-specifically, the social world.

“Because drama operates subjectively and objectively the learning is related to those concepts about which value judgements are made.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 38)

Part of drama is learning social skills. It is located in the affective domain and involves emotions.

“teachers have often paid lip-service to, or ignored, the affective orientation, or equally mistakenly, have assumed that such an orientation means free expression rather than understanding.” (Bolton, 1979, p. 39)

Bolton lays emphasis on this concern with emotion, which he considers necessary for understanding. He would also make a claim for learning dramatic art form, or what he calls ‘formal drama’ and others would call theatre.

Bolton uses the terms ‘formal drama’ and ‘informal drama’ rather than theatre and drama. He argues against the view that drama should be geared towards ‘how it seems from the outside’ (Bolton, 1979, p. 11) but admits

that some 'formal' drama or 'sharing with an audience' is permissible on occasions.

Although he agrees that in 'formal' drama work can be 'geared to the importance of an end product' (Bolton, 1979, p. 9), he is definitely of the view that it is *in* the process that the learning occurs. He is an advocate of negotiation and the interactive process between students and his focus is on the process of the work in hand and not the product.

Assessment

With regard to assessment, Bolton speaks of drama's 'worthiness' but relates how

"Some people expect to observe an improvement in skills, others a group awareness; some...syllabuses see a knowledge of theatre studies as an ultimate goal" (Bolton, 1979, p. 133).

He goes on to explain the difficulty for the drama teacher

"in that his two major aims of change of understanding, which is to do with values and satisfaction from and understanding of the art form, are not behaviours that can be tested." (Bolton, 1979, p. 133)

Bolton considers that assessment of progress can really only be known to the teacher, who is in the best position to look at either the way a student reflects on his experiences or the 'degree of ease with which he generalises from the experience' (Bolton, 1979, p. 136). As ability in drama is tied, not to achievement in drama, but to personal development, this makes it particularly difficult for examiners who are really being asked to assess the maturity of the students or what they are like as people. Although weight has been given here to Bolton's acceptance of some formal drama, this was to highlight a small difference between Bolton and Heathcote. Bolton is essentially a DIE practitioner.

NEELANDS

Jonathan Neelands is also a DIE practitioner. He is a former Secondary and Middle school teacher, who later became Advisory Teacher for English and drama in Northamptonshire, where his responsibilities included both primary and secondary schools. His contribution is valuable, because as well as being a well-known author and figure in drama circles, he also taught English and has carried out classroom research in the area of English teaching.

Neelands holds the view that drama is a classroom resource, which is not dependent on specialist teachers. It is a resource for *all* teachers. Drama

“seeks to develop and extend children’s existing cultural resources in ways that are both familiar and also stretching.” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6)

He also asserts that

“Drama is practical, immediate and engages the emotions as well as the intellect” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6).

It brings the dimension of action to the classroom. It is primarily social. Importantly Neelands claims “it is not seen as a subject or as a distinct curriculum area” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6).

Drama is regarded as child centred, but depending upon a form of teacher intervention, which “aims to bring new shapes and fresh ways of knowing.” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6). Learning is not about the acquisition of objective theories about the world but “sensual and practical involvement” (Neelands, 1984, p. 2) with the world. Children are not seen as passive but as “active meaning makers” (Neelands, 1984). The emphasis in the classroom is on ‘story’ and ‘play.’

Neelands states that drama is not as concerned with the conveyance of theatre skills as it is with “imagined experience” He asserts clearly that

“Drama is to do with the child experiencing rather than the child performing.” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6)

Theatre is seen as the art form at the furthest point of a drama continuum, the origin of which is child-play.

Neelands is not really concerned with outcomes, but with a process-centred experience which

“provides an authentic mirroring of ‘real life’ learning where new problems are synthesized through structures and methods formulated to enable effective discovery.”
(Neelands, 1984, p. 4)

For Neelands, it is in the process where the learning occurs. He is not interested in assessing a drama product.

Assessment

Neelands does not recognise drama as a discrete subject, and therefore assessment does not come into the equation. He states clearly that drama “is not quantifiable or academic” (Neelands, 1984, p. 6.) Drama is a classroom resource and a learning tool. It is not a subject to be assessed.

HORNBROOK

The biggest challenge to the Drama-In-Education theories of Heathcote, which dominated the 1970s and 1980s, came from David Hornbrook (1989). His book coincided with the launch of the National Curriculum and the now famous (in drama circles) National Association of Teachers of Drama (NATD) conference of 1989, when the NATD declared “the fight for drama was the fight for education” (promotional literature 1989). So when the Drama in Education lobby was at its most militant, Hornbrook proclaimed the death of dramatic pedagogy and proposed a new curriculum of dramatic art. He thus reopened the debate about the theatre/drama divide by seeking to bring the two elements together.

Hornbrook’s objection to DIE practice was that it deprived pupils of access to an art form which is more mainstream in our society. This was a persuasive argument as plausibly, if people in western culture heard the word ‘drama’ they were more likely to associate the word with theatre or plays than the specialised use of the term by Heathcote et al. Hornbrook’s

other objections to DIE were firstly, that drama being used for personal development reduced drama teachers to the status of social engineers; and secondly, that treating drama as a learning medium reduced the status of the subject to the point where it became just a service agency for the rest of the curriculum.

Although Hornbrook (1989) has elsewhere challenged the views of Heathcote and Bolton, he would agree that drama is an art form, "Drama is a performing art" (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 4). However, it is an art form that has evolved its own cultural and historical rules and parameters. This means that if teachers merely respond to the students' own culture, they deny them access to their own (teachers') so the students do not 'grow' or progress. This line of thought is similar to the Kempe and Nicholson (2001) assertion that

"rejecting the value of existing knowledge on the grounds that the only really useful knowledge is acquired through experience has never been a sound argument (must children get burnt to learn that playing with fire is dangerous?)" (Kempe and Nicholson , 2001, p. 21)

What is required is a subtle balance

"As well as having opportunities to improvise as they progress in drama, students should be increasingly confronted by published work of all kinds" (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 5).

Hornbrook is here attempting to bring the idea of 'text' into drama teaching. He goes on to say:

"The dramatic curriculum must accept play scripts as an essential part of the study of drama." (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 5)

As well as this attention to text, Hornbrook introduces to the drama curriculum the ideas of 'acting', 'plays' and 'theatre' and technical skills such as sound, lighting and set design. This is to facilitate the desired fusion of drama and theatre that he advocates.

Hornbrook (1996) argues that drama education in schools should draw its curriculum from a critical engagement with the cultural and historical circumstances which sustain us, and with which we must try to make sense of our condition. Making meaning for drama provides the required intellectual underpinning for the subject. The content of instruction therefore should be in the context of theatre and text.

His ‘dramatic art’ starts from where teachers are, that is, in the everyday experience of their classes and out-of-school drama activities. He offered

“a structure whereby we may better understand both what we have been doing and where we may go...” (Hornbrook, 1989 p. 64)

He argues that if students are to create their own drama, then they must first understand dramatic form:

“Mastery of form goes along with the ability to express content, and form is only learned through experiencing a rich variety of options.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 2)

This means that the teacher should provide both a content base and a context enabling students to work in a more structured way.

Hornbrook is keen for what he sees as the unnatural divide between drama and theatre to disappear. With regard to such elements as set design, sound, lighting and costume, Hornbrook writes:

“Skills like these are part of the very substance of drama at *all* levels. Taken together, they help to represent that body of knowledge, understanding and aptitudes, which is dramatic art. Without their unabashed presence in schools, the dramatic curriculum will be seriously impoverished” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 6).

Skills such as these are part of the structure of drama and should be accessible to all pupils, not just those who progress to Theatre Studies at Advanced Level.

Although Hornbrook regards the 'process' as important, he does not regard it as an end in itself, but thinks that the 'crafting process' should be aimed at successful drama. In this view he echoes Byron (1986) who argues that the basic conditions for the drama lesson should be the ones that 'enable the work to succeed' (Byron, 1986, p.166) For Hornbrook, art and the artist do not operate separately from society; this is a romantic view. The artist is in society – a product of and a contribution to it. There appeared to be the need for some kind of intellectual underpinning of the concept of drama because

“Drama in schools has also been marked by a reluctance to engage with the process of skills acquisition.”
(Hornbrook, 1991, p. 5)

He speaks rather slightly of students being 'initiated' into the 'rites' of the drama process and claims that skills are only acquired this way incidentally

“The strong emphasis, which has traditionally been placed on process in drama - expressive, developmental and pedagogic - and the corresponding conceptual inability of the dramatic product, lies at the root of the problem, for it has obscured the idea of drama as craft.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 69).

Drama is a craft and therefore should have an end product and according to Hornbrook

“We should not be afraid to acknowledge, therefore, that performing is as important in drama as it is for dance and music.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 129)

Hornbrook was promoting the idea that drama could be successful, not just because the process had brought about some change in the student or because of the student's ability to reflect upon their experience, but because what they had crafted was valuable in itself.

In the process-dominated 1970s and 1980s, Hornbrook claimed that, within the drama classroom

“few attempted to identify, much less monitor, how students actually got better at *drama itself*.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 7)

Hornbrook contends that attention to content in the form of text and theatre skills would remedy this omission and claims that, in fact

“The making of plays, in various guises, actually already figures in most drama assessment schemes. Drama teachers would reasonably expect success in this area to require a combination of good ideas, knowledge of possible forms, suitable theatre skills, and generally productive group dynamics.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 128)

Despite this mention of ‘group dynamics,’ Hornbrook asserts that there is no necessary equation between good art and comradeship and that

“While much work in drama is naturally social there are times when students are most productive working by themselves. This should be acknowledged in any assessment scheme, as should the contributions made to a successful production by student writers, directors, stage-managers, designers and so on.” (Hornbrook, 1991, p. 129)

Hornbrook was also happy for students to achieve in purely technical, theatre skills, if this was the area of drama in which their expertise lay.

There is one more name to be considered in this section. Peter Abbs is not a renowned theorist of drama; his expertise lies in the field of English. However, his views regarding drama are germane to this investigation as he regards drama as being allied with English and other arts. Consideration of his approach is given below.

Although the majority of drama theorists argue the case for a discrete subject, there are those who regard drama from the perspective of English lessons. Abbs (1982) wants drama to form an alliance with English, as well as with art, dance, music and film. He is concerned with the expressive and aesthetic nature of these subjects, but after discussion of the above, he concludes

“The precise relationship of English with the other arts awaits formulation” (Abbs, 1982, p. 124)

However, Abbs argues for drama to rest in the aesthetic field. According to the aesthetic model English does not stress sufficiently ‘making and presenting’; drama does not stress sufficiently ‘presenting’ (in its more formal aspects) and ‘evaluating’...” Abbs wants a balance. He wants to combine English, drama, and the other arts. (Abbs, 1987) This coherent, aesthetic curriculum would be for all children though with special reference to pupils who generally are not regarded as academic successes at school and whose aesthetic mode of intelligence goes unrecognised.

“The expressive disciplines exist to bring together, at the highest possible level, the individual and his culture. Their concern is the mediation of experience through expressive form both in the making of expressive form and the sympathetic study of it in the culture. That is at once the nature of the arts and their justification.” (Abbs, 1982, p. 120)

Like Hornbrook, he gives drama a cultural context. Similarly, with regard to the theatre/drama debate Abbs thinks that

“...the division between drama and theatre which the progressive view inaugurated has created false arguments and false divisions in the drama community.” Abbs (1987, p. 163)

Part of this false division is concerned with an unwillingness on the part of some drama teachers to see performance as part of drama work. He calls for presentation and for performance:

“Through presentations...and through performances... the art work is taken out into the world until, at best, it enters into the imagination of the human race.” (Abbs, 1982, p. 44)

Abbs thinks that drama needs the response of an audience, as they are part of the art making process. So whilst discussing the artist in society, Abbs claimed

“It is his function to bring the truth of the emotion as determined by the art home to society” (Abbs, 1982, p. 44)

When society has received the artist’s performance then the creative process is thus complete.

Concerning assessment, Abbs (1982) thinks that emphasis ought to be given to both the product and the process, but offers no clear definition of how assessment is to be carried out.

Drama as an Art Form

All the major theorists describe drama as an art form. Taking ‘art form’ to mean an established medium of artistic expression, it is necessary to examine the elements, which make up the art form of drama. The theorists share the view of drama

“as an aesthetically powerful mode of making meaning in contemporary culture.” (Fleming, 1997, p.44)

but they do not all agree that Drama is “art, text and performance.” (Franks, 1999, p.44) There is a need for clarity about what the art form is. Art is a human skill, and therefore involves

“selection and employment of artistic form to create meaning.” (Fleming, 1997, p.6)

Drama shares several elements with other art forms. For example, the fact that meaning is conveyed through dialogue is shared with the novel, conveying meaning through symbol is shared with both poetry and painting, utilization of space is shared with sculpture and operating over time is shared with music. What makes drama unique is the art form’s particular combination of the above elements plus its use of manipulated time, together with its control of focus to create its meaning.

“Getting better at drama has partly to do with an increasing skill in being able to take an idea and translate it into dramatic form; that ability is likely to be developed by examining the way dramatists do the same. It has also to do with gaining some insight, however implicitly into the nature of the art form.” (Fleming, 1997, p. 4)

Therein lies the problem. ‘Getting better at drama.’ Whereas definition of the art form may be achievable, (apart from a question about the position of theatre) as soon as drama is placed within the school curriculum there is a necessity for assessment, which opens up a whole different area of debate.

The purpose of this discussion including the perspectives of major theorists has been to ascertain whether the views of key people in the field would provide more clarity with regard to the teaching and assessment of drama. Unfortunately, they do not express a uniform view. Although there are similarities such as the fact that they all consider drama to be an art form and they all consider the drama process to be important to learning, there are conspicuous differences as well. Thus, clarity about the nature of drama instruction is not enhanced because they reflect divergences in the key areas of what the content of drama should be, the role of theatre and technical skills, and exactly what is (or should be) being assessed.

Summary

As we have seen, there is continuing debate about the nature of drama instruction and its assessment. Divergence in opinion about how it should be taught seems to have emerged from actual changes in teaching over time. The differing opinions are reflected in writings of the theorists in the field. Heathcote, Bolton and Neelands regard drama as a social process in which meanings are revealed or discovered. The subject of drama is the condition of humanity and involves reflection. It as an art form which is characterized by action on the part of the students and involves the affective domain. The result of participating in drama is some form of personal development or change but as drama is a teaching tool assessment is not considered relevant. Theatre is a side issue for these practitioners. Hornbrook criticized these DIE theories on the grounds that drama is not just a teaching tool for personal development but is a craft and should have a product. The intellectual underpinning should include an engagement with culture and history. Theatre and texts are a part of drama and students should also acquire technical and theatre skills. Successful drama is a viable concept and therefore assessment is valid. Abbs makes a claim for drama to unite with English and other arts in a broad aesthetic curriculum, regarding the theatre/drama controversy as divisive and combining the process and the product, but with no clear direction on assessment.

Similar to the major theorists, teachers may have differing views on the instruction of drama. Attitudes may be changing with regard to drama instruction for five reasons:

1. The fact that drama does not enjoy a status in its own right as a National Curriculum subject, but in Key Stage Three, comes under the English Attainment target 1, *Speaking and Listening*.
2. The continuing debates within the subject on the content of drama e.g. the process/product debate and the drama /theatre debate
3. The issue of there being no commonly agreed methods of assessment in the subject.
4. The change in assessment emphasis which gives greater weighting to the written component at GCSE.

5. The move, at GCSE level, towards assessment of theatre and technical skills.

These points all contribute to a lack of clarity about which skills and knowledge are unique to drama and about what the assessment criteria should be. As a result, this research sets out to examine how closely the views of current practitioners mesh with the views of theorists on definition, content, the two main debates and assessment. Of greater importance, the principal aim is to see how their views map onto the one perspective of drama instruction that is embodied by the specifications of the National Curriculum.

In the next chapter, I will explore the theoretical frameworks that underlie the various perspectives on the contents and delivery of drama instruction as well as its assessment. As we have seen, there appears to be a silence concerning assessment by the Drama-In-Education theorists. Therefore, before proceeding with an investigation of teachers' beliefs and perspectives, it is essential to understand the theoretical frameworks, which inform teachers' views about the way drama should be taught and assessed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the past, there were basically two models of learning. These broadly can be summarized under the headings of behavioural and cognitive theories. More recently, education has also seen the emergence of sociocognitive theory as a third perspective on how learning occurs. This approach reflects the idea that cognitive development does not occur in a vacuum but is mediated by the environment in which it takes place. Each of these theoretical approaches to learning has major implications for teaching.

The purpose of this review is to explore how behavioural, cognitive and sociocognitive approaches to learning relate to the way drama has been taught over the past thirty years. The aim is to see how the three theoretical perspectives relate to what teachers of drama actually think and practise. This means that the literature review will look at how students learn and, in particular, how they learn in drama. One way of discovering how drama teachers think that students learn, is to look at how drama has been taught over the last thirty years and to try to map it onto three broad theoretical perspectives on how learning occurs (See fig. 2:1, Models of Learning, below). This chapter will focus on teachers' beliefs in the remaining part of the literature review.

Three key features of this review will be:

- Drama teaching and Learning (Content, Delivery and Assessment)
- Teachers' Beliefs
- Vygotskian/ Sociocognitive Theory

The position of drama in schools has developed considerably over the past thirty years. Originally, there was an assumption that drama was to do with analysis of texts or training students as performers for the school play (Bolton, 1984). However, practising drama teachers might contest this assumption. On this subject of what practising teachers believe about their work, Pajares (1992) argued that teachers' beliefs are legitimate data for enquiry and should inform educational practice. In order for this to happen, clear definitions are required for concepts and understanding as beliefs

help people with identification and socialization processes and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between beliefs and knowledge.

Nespor (1992) in his research of eight teachers, argues that four features distinguished belief from knowledge: *Existential Presumption* - making assumptions about what is the case; *Alternativity* - a view of an ideal that contrasts with reality; *Affective and Evaluate Loading* - strong feelings about what should be learnt, so that

“...respects, feelings, moods and subjective evaluations based on personal preferences seem to operate more or less independently of other forms of cognition typically associated with language systems.” (Nespor, 1992, p. 319)

and *Episodic Structure*, beliefs associated with well-remembered events.

“...belief systems often include affective feelings and evaluations, vivid memories of personal experiences, and assumptions about the existence of entities and alternative worlds, all of which are simply not open to outside evaluation of critical examination in the same sense that the components of knowledge systems are.” (Nespor, 1992, p. 321)

The idea being that beliefs about teaching are bound up in teachers' larger belief systems, so that understanding teachers' goals is of vital importance as teachers' classroom practice has its source in their own beliefs.

Conclusions drawn from the questions addressed in the preceding discussion should reveal whether there is a match between teachers' beliefs and perspectives on the content, delivery and assessment of drama and those implied by the National Curriculum. If there is not, then there will be implications for drama teachers delivering their subject under the auspices of both the National Curriculum and the GCSE examinations.

MODELS OF LEARNING

Models of learning have moved on from the behaviourist approach or the information processing approach of the 1950s and 1960s, when psychology used mathematical models to explain human learning. Chomsky (1975) rejected these theories of learning and work in cognitive science paved the way for the cognitive theories of the 1970s and 1980s. Sociocognitive theories gained ground with the rediscovery of Vygotskian theory. A summary of the three approaches referred to in this research, behavioural, cognitive and sociocognitive, appears below.

Figure 2.1: Models Of Learning

Behavioural	Cognitive	Sociocognitive
Passive learner	Active learner	Active learner
Learning occurs as a result of stimuli and responses	Learning occurs when the student actively tries to understand the environment	Learning begins with shared social behaviour. Learning occurs in the Zone of Proximal Development
Learning is the acquisition of new associations	Learning consists of changes in mental structure brought about by mental reasoning	Learning is experiential. Idea of cognitive apprenticeship.
Knowledge consists of learned patterns	Knowledge consists of an organised set of mental structures and procedures	Knowledge is not absolute but arises from interaction between teacher and learner within a social setting
New learning is influenced by prior knowledge through indirect processes such as positive or negative transfer because of similarity of stimuli between situations	New learning is based on using prior knowledge, to understand new situations and on changing prior knowledge structures to deal with new situations	New learning is built on the internalisation, by the learner, of the shared cognitive processes, enabling the learner to extend existing knowledge and skills.
Education consists of arranging stimuli so that desired associations are made.	Education consists of allowing/encouraging active mental exploration of complex environments.	Education consists of joint problem solving.

Source: Andre and Phye 1986, p.2. (parts of first two columns only)

The Behavioural Approach

With regard to content, the behavioural school of thought suggests that knowledge consists of a coherent body of information and learned patterns, and that teaching is concerned with passing on this body of knowledge. Learning occurs as a result of stimuli and responses, along the lines of Pavlov's (1927) theory of conditioned reflexes, which relies on reinforcement or, according to Skinner (1938), intermittent reinforcement. The learning conditions and the teachers' classroom strategies are the same in all cases and there is no allowance for individual differences in learners. Such ideas are to be found in the writings of theorists such as Lawlor (1989) who argues for 'a solid basis of knowledge and fundamental techniques' (Lawlor, 1989 p. 68) Within areas where the subject matter is more 'concrete' for example the pure sciences, then this approach is quite workable. However, where the content of a subject is not so fact based, as in the case of drama, this approach is more difficult to apply.

With reference to teaching, behavioural theories tend to address teaching as presenting students with a set of behaviours to be mastered or skills that are taught according to some hierarchy of drill and practice.

"A basic tenet of the behaviourist school is that learning is seen as linear and sequential. Complex understandings occur only when elemental prerequisite learnings are mastered." (Gipps, 1994, p. 19)

Shepherd (1991) demonstrates how within this model the student cannot move on from a basic level to higher level until the basic is mastered. This involves constant repetition, whereby the learner is a passive recipient of learning, which consists of the acquisition of new associations. Progression occurs when simple behaviours are chained together and shaped into more complex behaviour (Snelbecker, 1974). New learning is influenced by prior knowledge through indirect processes such as positive or negative transfer because of the similarity of stimuli between situations.

In general terms, behavioural theories encourage the idea of the teacher in total control of the learning in their classroom. However, this approach becomes more difficult for the teaching of drama as students are actively participating by 'doing' in a drama lesson. It would not be possible to have behaviour determined by the consequences it has produced in the past, (Glaserfeld, 1989) because drama is so variable in outcome. Furthermore, reinforcement is not usually necessary, successful drama often being its own reward for students. However, a behaviourist approach could be considered more appropriate for the learning of theatre or technical skills as the student has to learn certain applicable 'facts', observable and malleable phenomena which are easier to assess. A more behaviourist approach could also be considered useful for some writing tasks, for example critical accounts of live theatre productions, which may be mastered by drill and practice.

A behavioural perspective would require student's work to be assessed by specific short-answer questions in a test, with a simple right answer to each question. This follows from the behaviourist point of view that education consists of arranging stimuli so that desired associations are made. Freire (1989) would argue that this approach negates people because they are seen as machines. Assessment would be calibrated and graded in a hierarchical way. There would be the need for a student to 'pass' one stage before starting on the next stage. Knowledge thus consists of learned patterns and the testing of this knowledge is mechanical and straightforward. However, in the behavioural approach, the knowledge acquired can normally only be applied to situations the students are already familiar with having already been taught these by the teacher.

The behavioural approach to assessment has not been evident in the history of drama teaching. The very nature of the subject does not lend itself to learning facts or single 'right' answers for paper and pencil tests, as drama has traditionally been taught in an 'active' classroom with little emphasis on writing. Within the drama classroom, there has existed the view, maintained by Glaserfeld (1989), that not all that matters in learning is observable. However, since the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1988, there may be some scope for a more behavioural approach particularly if practical work becomes more product orientated and drama teachers are required to focus more on outcomes, such as staging a performance. According to

Skinner (1968) the idea is to construct a programme, which makes the students' progress observable to both the student and the teacher. Theatre, with its more established sets of technical skills, also lends itself to this approach, as does the greater emphasis on written work within the subject at GCSE level.

Research on teachers' cognition began to shift in the 1970s/80s from a primarily behaviourist standpoint to a concern with how teachers understand their work. Studies such as the work of Shavelson (1973), who regarded a prime skill of teaching to be the ability to ask the right question of the right child at the right time, had the effect of shifting the focus away from what teachers do in the classroom to ways in which teachers think.

The idea that people construct their own reality and that knowledge is not absolute, gained ground with the cognitive psychology approach as evidenced by Winne and Marx (1977) who coined the term *Cognitive Mediation Model* and drew attention to the psychological relationship between the teacher and the students, claiming that there was a call for "...considering the bi-directional nature of classroom influences..." (Winne and Marx, 1977, p. 676), rather than the one directional teacher-led approach of the behaviourist school. However, although Winne and Marx look at the relationship between knowledge, thought and behaviour between teacher and student they do not consider the influences at work between the students themselves, which occur regularly in the drama classroom.

Such studies as the above resulted in the development of theories of 'knowledge structure' (Anderson, 1983). Leinhardt and Greeno (1986) investigating the everyday working knowledge of teachers asserted that the skill of teaching was dependent upon two factors or systems of knowledge; namely, lesson structure and subject matter. Nevertheless, while this focus on subject was welcome, the research was mainly concerned with the structure, routines and techniques of teaching rather than content or assessment.

Further studies contributing to the idea of the centrality of the teacher to the educational process and the role of the teacher in curriculum development

included Doyle and Ponder (1977) and Stenhouse (1975). The latter advocated the role of the teacher as researcher and investigated teachers' professional development within the process of curriculum change. There was now recognition of teachers' cognitive activity.

The Cognitive Approach

The cognitive approach consists of an ordered, interaction between teacher and student. With regard to content, the cognitive school of thought suggests that knowledge consists of an organized set of mental structures and procedures and that learning occurs when the student actively tries to understand and eventually masters these structures and procedures. Action and self directed problem solving is at the heart of learning development. Cognitive theory became prominent in the 1960s with the rediscovery of Piaget (1926), who denied the stimulus response mechanism of behaviourism, and declared that knowledge was operative not figurative. Once again, there are several subjects on the school curriculum, such as mathematics and the sciences, for which this approach would work well and the view that learning occurs when the student 'actively' tries to understand their environment might appear apposite for drama.

Cognitive theories tend to present teaching as engaging the students in the learning of concepts and of problem solving exercises, using students' creativity, so that information is interpreted (Resnick, 1989). The emphasis is on both product and process and involves active mental exploration of complex environments, including reflection. Following Shepard's (1991) contention that students learn when things make sense to them, the role of the teacher is as 'sage' or 'expert' who at the beginning of the lesson usually gives an exposition on the procedures, which are to take place. However, the teacher does not merely transfer knowledge, the student is an active learner and this learning consists of changes in mental structure brought about by mental reasoning. The student ponders the question, internalises the procedures and can question the teacher. The student/teacher relationship is critical, even Socratic in form. New learning is based on using prior knowledge to understand new situations and on changing prior knowledge structures to deal with new situations. Therefore, these cognitive procedures can be transferred to new situations.

As we have seen, investigation of the social effects of teaching had previously focused on policies, structure and routines. In the 1970s, fuller accounts were given including how teachers interpreted and were affected by the political, ideological and material contexts in which they worked. Now the key role of the teacher was recognised and there was an emphasis on teachers' decision making (Eggleston, 1979). Similarly, Woods (1980) produced a collection of articles which considered ways in which teachers tried to achieve their ends and the issues which affected them.

Research then expanded from this rather limited view of teachers' cognitive activity to include teachers' perceptions, reflections and evaluations of their own work. Finally, research began to concern itself with teachers' knowledge and beliefs. With controversies such as the process/product and theatre/drama debates alive within the drama world, teachers' beliefs are crucial in determining what drama consists of and how drama is delivered.

Concerning content, Shulman (1986a), in particular, highlighted the subject matter knowledge of teaching, which he thought was an underdeveloped area of research. Shulman thought that the ways that teachers understood their subject matter and its relationship to how they taught merited further investigation. Others looked at knowledge and beliefs acquired before and during training. In Bullough et al. (1991) the teacher was regarded as a personality, with a history of experiences which may have contributed to their implicit ideas about teaching and learning. Charting the progress of six teachers in their first year in the classroom, through interview and observation, Bullough et al. (1991), investigated the changes in these teachers from their original preconceptions about teaching to the end of their first year. At the start of training, whilst a love of subject was common, a certain vagueness about a teacher's role was also evident though there was a tendency to regard teachers as 'experts'. There was criticism of subject content being too heavily prescribed as "intellectually stultifying" (Bullough et al., 1991, p. 26.) and one teacher's need to stick too closely to the textbook was "at the cost of process" (Bullough et al. 1991, p. 26.). However, much of the discussion in this research was concerned with how the student teachers overcame discipline problems with a mixture of trial and error approaches predominating. In particular, Elbaz (1983), in a single

case study, showed a teacher's knowledge to be experiential and continually developing in the light of changing purposes and values. Further case studies, Clandinin (1986) for instance, criticised the lack of research focus on teachers' experience and investigated teachers' beliefs in the form of conceptualisation of images. These case studies, although limited in the number of participants, showed beliefs to be idiosyncratic, tacit and contradictory. If this is the case, it is not surprising that there is so much debate concerning the drama teacher where there is no accepted body of knowledge to draw on.

There is room for the cognitive approach in drama teaching as drama teachers refer to learning of concepts such as the 'drama conventions' and also use phrases such as 'problem-solving' to describe certain activities in their lessons. Students are also encouraged to use their 'creativity.' The cognitive model recognises such internal procedures, which are concerned with aesthetics, motivation and making judgements. Nonetheless, emphasis on product rather than process is more difficult for drama teachers, who have generally required some emphasis to be placed on the process. However, the theories of Hornbrook (1989) are closer to the Cognitive perspective as they emphasise both product and process.

Drama assessment, following the cognitive model, would require essay questions involving thinking processes as the cognitive perspective consists of allowing or encouraging active mental exploration of complex environments. Piaget's (1926) orientation usually is with regard to cognitive dissonance or the changes that can occur in an individual's thinking when they converge with the thinking of others. For Piaget (1926) progress is determined by the child's stage of cognitive development. Whilst such an approach may well be satisfactory for a subject such as English Literature or History where the 'exploration' is mental, there could well be limitations in drama where the engagement with the content should be 'active,' that is, using the body as well as the mind. The National Curriculum makes an acknowledgement towards the cognitive approach in its presentation of essay questions for the GCSE drama syllabuses and in its assessment of the 'product' in practical work, reinforced by use of an external moderator to verify the teacher's marking. The word 'creativity,' often used in

conjunction with drama, is offered a definition by Cropley (2001). He says that creativity involves novelty, effectiveness and ethicality and that whereas conventional intelligence is heavily dependent on ‘recognizing, recalling and reapplying,’

“Creativity on the other hand, involves departing from facts, finding new ways, making unusual associations, or seeing unexpected solutions.” (Cropley, 2001).

The person handling information in a creative way must therefore be versatile and flexible.

The Sociocognitive Approach

In this approach, the teacher does not necessarily know when she starts the lesson what the final product will be, unlike the certainty of outcome, which marks the other two perspectives. Therefore, the Sociocognitive method already indicates a more versatile and flexible style. With regard to content, the sociocognitive approach suggests that knowledge is not absolute but arises from interaction between teacher and learner, and learner and learner, all within a social setting. It also suggests that learning begins with shared social behaviour and actually occurs in the ‘zone of proximal development.’ (to be discussed later in this section)

With reference to teaching, sociocognitive theories are concerned with the concept of ‘cognitive apprenticeship’ where learning is guided and experiential. New learning is built on the internalisation, by the learner, of the shared cognitive and social processes; thus enabling the learner to extend existing knowledge and skills. Learners suggest ways forward, improvise and try things out. The teacher is part of the learning process and acts as guide or partner.

Assessment from a sociocognitive perspective requires tasks that are performance based, for example, a portfolio of activities or assessment of a student actively engaging in the actual experiences that actors employ. Situated learning, as this process is called, is socio-cultural and assessment must deal with this fact as drama education consists of joint problem solving between teacher and learner, and learner and learner. This is rather than the

individual quest for enlightenment, which marks both the behavioural and cognitive perspectives, particularly the latter. External moderation of the student's work is often required as the teacher has been involved in the process which has shaped the final outcome.

The sociocognitive perspective is a good match for drama because the key difference between behavioural and cognitive approaches is where the emphasis is placed. The behavioural tends to focus on observed learning. There is no extrapolation of what is going on in the learners' head based on outcomes. The cognitive tries to work out the processing and knowledge structuring that occurs in the learners' mind. That is why there is a different emphasis on process and product. The behavioural focuses more on the product because it is observable and directly measurable. The sociocognitive emphasizes the processing side. Besides the weight given to the process, learning in drama is also essentially bound up with action and performance. It is not something that can be written about; it has to be practised and honed. It has creative performance and thinking components that need to be actively exercised, rehearsed and refined with someone who is more 'expert' than the students, yet at the same time is engaged with the students in the learning process.

Underpinning this investigation is the view of knowledge as "socially constructed." The historical shift to the sociocognitive approach involved a 'rediscovery' of Vygotskian theory and the theoretical framework that is adopted in this research follows the work of Vygotsky (1986). He argued that

"The progress in concept formation by a child achieved in co-operation with an adult, is a much more sensitive gauge of the child's intellectual abilities than the methods of mental testing that routinely took into account only the problem solving progress made by the child who is left on his own." (Vygotsky, 1986 p. 174)

Vygotsky called for

“instruction, oriented to the child’s strength rather than his weakness, thus encouraging him to advance to the next level of development.” (Vygotsky, 1986, p. 174)

The next section of this chapter will include a discussion of Vygotskian theory as it relates to issues of learning and assessment from a sociocognitive perspective. Although Vygotsky is not the sole voice in this area, I have looked to his writings as the key theoretical foundation for this topic. The topics addressed include: socially mediated learning; cognitive apprenticeship; the role of the teacher; the role of language; the role of assessment both in general terms and from a sociocognitive perspective.

Socially Mediated Learning

Vygotsky (1978) writes of the notion that shared social behaviour is the beginning stage of learning. This gives responsibility to those who interact socially with children, that is both teachers and other children, as learning is a constant process. The teachers’ role is to be the expert and aid the students who are, in this sense, in apprenticeship to them. This echoes the drama-In-Education theories of Heathcote and Bolton with their emphasis on the Teacher-In-Role approach. By interacting in such a way, teachers’ awareness of approaches to shared behaviour, and of the snags and obstacles to achieving this behaviour, is made available to learners. This can also be applied to the way in which teachers learn their craft and their own beliefs are developed.

Anning (1988), in her research project working with primary teachers on LEA and INSET courses, used videotapes of teachers in the classroom and interviews. In the interviews, Anning found difficulties with teachers articulating what they thought that the students were learning. The responses were vague and concerned with ‘hunches’ or intuitions.’ However, videotaped evidence did point to the fact that they were applying a commonsense framework.

“The point is made that teacher theory is inherent in their practice and that it is *through* their practice that it is constantly re-formulated and tested. Hence, the variations in teacher beliefs will be dependent upon their

varying professional experiences as well as the context in which they are working.” (Anning, 1988, p. 143)

The kind of cyclical process of ‘reflection-in-action’, which Schon (1983), described, is subscribed to here. This represents a kind of ‘knowing’ inherent in intelligent action

“It is suggested that teachers generate theory through cumulative experiences and reflection on teaching and learning. In evaluating each new teaching and learning event, the principles embedded in teachers’ theories are further confirmed, refined or modified.”

(Anning, 1988, p. 143-144)

So the learning process continues for the teacher and the learner, the resultant theories being grounded in experience.

“If teachers themselves are involved in the processes of generating theory, which is then articulated in a language familiar to them, it is more likely to be shared with colleagues and translated into practice rather than be left lying unopened in paper form.” (Anning, 1988, p. 144)

This idea of the social genesis of individual understanding is to be found in Vygotsky:

“the fundamental process of development is the gradual internalisation and personalisation of what was a social activity.” (Brown and Palincsar, 1985, p. 347)

The concept of proleptic teaching is discussed by Wertsch and Stone (1979) where following Vygotsky, they write of situations where students are required to participate in group activity before they are able to perform unaided; the social context supporting the individual’s efforts.

Teachers are, in Vygotsky's terms, lending consciousness to those learners and enabling them to perform, in these relationships, tasks they could not achieve if left to themselves. Vygotsky argued that:

“Thinking is a social activity, initially shared between people but gradually internalised to re-appear as individual achievement.” (Brown and Palincsar, 1985, p. 296)

This progression is constantly in operation in the Heathcote drama lesson, as the teacher operates frequently in role and takes an active part in the lessons working in role alongside the students. For Vygotsky, this process of thinking with the teacher is opening up for the learner the Zone of Proximal Development.

The Zone of Proximal Development

The ZPD is the level of ability in which the student is located at a particular time. Previous achievements have lead the way to this level, but the student is now ready for the teacher or peer or group to assist him or her on to the achievement of the next stage. This is the moment in the lesson when the student has tried to go on to the next stage and cannot quite see how to make it work. The teacher or another student intervenes, or is asked to intervene, and together with the student, facilitates the next step. So the zone of proximal development is

“the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)

Brown and Ferrara (1985) conclude that one implication of Vygotsky's theory is

“the importance of aiming instruction at the upper band of a child's zone. By concentrating on the level a student can reach with aid, the student is led to levels of success

previously not envisaged by either the student or the teacher. If educational practices are geared only to the student's level of unaided competence that student may be denied the very experience necessary to increase her zone of proximal development." (Brown and Ferrara, 1985, p. 301)

The Role of the Teacher

The role of the teacher is bound up with the idea of socially mediated learning

"Two important and related theories in Vygotsky's writings are the social foundations of cognition and the importance of instruction in development." (Forman and Cazden, 1985, p. 323)

and also with the role of peers

"In all of Vygotsky's writings with which we are familiar, the social relationship referred to as 'teaching' is the one-to-one relationship between one adult and one child. When we try to explore Vygotskian perspectives for education, we immediately confront questions about the role of the student peer group." (Forman and Cazden, 1985, p. 323)

Vygotsky's (1986) psychological investigations discovered that one child could, in co-operation with others, solve problems designed for children three years older, while another child, working alone, could not go beyond problems intended for children of his own age. Collaborative working is at the heart of much of what happens in learning and is very much a part of the drama classroom. The teacher's role is to lead the students to the next stage and to further stages of learning. The question is: do teachers' beliefs reach this stage or do teachers see themselves as skilled instructors?

Teachers tend to begin training with a view of teaching as ‘telling and learning’. This was illustrated by Calderhead’s (1988) investigation of ten students, through their training year

“Much of the students’ teaching seemed to be based on their interpretations of how their supervising teacher taught.” (Calderhead, 1988, p. 39)

The student teachers’ initial performances were based either on teachers from their past, or their supervising teacher or learned behaviour designed to please their tutor in order to pass the course. Russell (1988) emphasised the contrast felt by student teachers between training and practice. He echoes Schon’s (1983) contrast between ‘technical rationality’ and ‘reflection-in-action.’ and in accordance with Anning (1988), speaks of how teachers

“...emphasize the very significant role of experience in the process of learning to teach, and they also suggest that experience is significant in learning the ‘theory’ of teaching.” (Russell, 1988, p. 32)

However, there can exist a gap between beliefs and actions:

“We are increasingly convinced that the image one holds of the relationship between theory and practice can significantly influence understanding of the personal learning process, at every stage in one’s development of the professional knowledge of teaching.” (Russell, 1988, p. 33)

Russell (1993) went on to point out that it was no good reflecting unless it resulted in some change:

“Is a teacher who can articulate principles of practice being reflective?” (Russell, 1993, p. 147)

Studies such as Calderhead (1988) and Russell (1988) show how student teachers original behaviourist beliefs may become problematical when

teachers are encouraged by their training institutions to adopt a sociocognitive approach and then find themselves having to challenge the child's own common sense thinking (Stoddart, 1992). Student teachers' beliefs were also investigated by attitude scales (Hoy and Rees, 1977). Similarly Lacey (1977) used attitude surveys on PGCE teachers to reveal how they were inclined to begin training with control-oriented attitudes. They tended to change to a more sociocognitive approach, in theory, during training, but then, in adapting their responses to the classroom situation, revert to their original approach after entering the profession when they tended to 'give up' and seek advice from more experienced teachers. However, this approach did vary according to subject.

“One of the characteristics that most coloured their early reaction to the course was the subject specialization of their first degree.” (Lacey, 1977, p. 58)

This was the idea of a broad subject divide: subjects, which fell more within the 'creative' sphere could not always be made to 'fit' being taught in an 'authoritative' way by a teacher as could other subjects. However, the sociocognitive approach, which drama teachers are encouraged to adopt in their teaching, can only succeed if its principles are internalised by the practitioner.

Forman and Cazden (1985) conclude that with regard to adult-child interaction and peer interaction within the structure of the school setting, it is the teachers who give directions and ask questions. These roles are not usually reversible; however

“the only context in which children can reverse interactional roles with the same intellectual content, giving directions as well as following them and asking questions as well as answering them, is with peers.”
(Forman and Cazden, 1985, p. 344)

Whilst it is true that the drama classroom offers this freedom amongst peers, it also presents the freedom for the student to give directions and ask questions on this level with the teacher, especially if the teacher is 'in role'

and as much a part of the action as the students. In this way, drama offers favourable conditions for cognitive apprenticeship.

Cognitive Apprenticeship

This is the notion of learning to do something related to thinking, learning and processing information, which emulates the way an expert practitioner would do that same thing. As Vygotsky (1986) says, the final product of this child-adult co-operation is a solution which, being internalised, becomes an integral part of a child's own reasoning. It is thus that new learning occurs

“An essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers. Once these processes are internalised, they become part of the child's independent developmental achievement (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 90)

and

“What the child is able to do in collaboration today, he will be able to do independently tomorrow.” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 206)

The teacher is there as a vital part of this collaboration:

“The teacher assists the pupils to organise the raw stuff of experience.... with other like instances. The assistance of cognitive structuring can often be achieved merely by making a general statement. Cognitive structures *organize* content and/or functions and (as a corollary) *refer* to like instances. These are the features that distinguish cognitive structuring from simple instructing.” (Moll, 1990, p. 183)

These are also features which are components of the drama classroom. Similarly, Rogoff (1990), writing that Cognitive development is an apprenticeship which occurs through guided participation in social activity

with companions who support and stretch children's understanding of and skills in using the tools of culture, states that

“Vygotsky's model for the mechanism through which social interaction facilitates cognitive development resembles apprenticeship, in which a novice works closely with an expert in joint problem solving in the zone of proximal development. The novice is thereby able to participate in skills beyond those that he or she is independently capable of handling. Development builds on the internalisation by the novice of the shared cognitive processes, appropriating what was carried out in collaboration to extend existing knowledge and skills.” (Rogoff, 1990, p. 141)

The social interaction and the cultural context both influence the individual's thinking processes, providing guidance, support, direction, challenge and impetus for development. Emphasis is placed on the importance of communication in problem solving as the individual in their social context responds to the neutral guided participation, which provides the scaffolding necessary for learning to occur. Peers and adults are thus partners in a child's learning development.

Rogoff (1990) writes of

“... children as apprentices in thinking, active in their efforts to learn from observing and participating with peers and more skilled members of society, developing skills to handle culturally defined problems with available tools and building from these givens to construct new solutions within the context of socio-cultural activity.” (Rogoff, 1990 p. 7)

This description is a good match for the teacher-student relationship in the drama classroom. Rogoff goes on to stress that this idea of an apprenticeship in thinking is not confined to the teacher-student relationship:

“Apprenticeship model has the value of including more people than a single expert and a single novice: the

apprenticeship system often involves a group of novices (peers) who serve as resources for one another in exploring the new domain and aiding and challenging one another.” (Rogoff, 1990 p. 39)

There is the notion of ‘shared thinking’ and the eventual appropriation of this shared thinking by the child for their own use. The drama classroom, with its frequent group work, utilises this idea of shared thinking continually as students solve problems together and in collaboration with their teacher. Vygotsky goes further than this. Within his argument he says that what children can do with the assistance of others is

“even more indicative of their mental development than what they can do alone.” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 409)

The drama teacher does not always know in advance where a particular drama process will go or what the students will decide to do in their given situation. In this way the teacher is learning along with the students. According to Rogoff:

“...the expert too is still developing breadth and depth of skills and understanding in the process of carrying out the activity and guiding others in it.” (Rogoff, 1990, p. 39)

The role of creativity in relation to guided participation is also important to Rogoff (1990)

“... the model provided by apprenticeship is one of active learners in a community of people who support, challenge and guide novices as they increasingly participate in skilled and valued socio-cultural activity.” (Rogoff, 1990, p. 39)

By working actively in partnership with each student, the drama teacher is in a good position to work within each student’s zone and to be part of the student’s cognitive apprenticeship.

Much of the situated learning of the drama classroom, underpinned by sociocognitive theory, has been accurately described by Hennessy:

“...development is not spontaneous but is channelled through sociocultural activity, in which children and their partners are interdependent. Social exchanges are continuous and essential bases for advances in individuals’ ways of thinking and acting. Communications and shared problem solving inherently bridge the gaps between old and new knowledge, and between partners’ differing understanding of the values and tools of the culture, which itself is revised and recreated as they seek a common ground of shared understanding.” (Hennessey, 1993, p. 15)

This common ground of shared understanding can only be attained if the teacher knows where they are aiming. Efforts to try to chart the development of the knowledge base of teachers were made by Morine-Dersheimer (1991b, April) and McNamara (1990) who criticized previous research on the grounds of the separation of cognition and behaviour.

“The major and disturbing gap in the literature is the failure of researchers to investigate teachers’ thought processes in so far as they address the content of the curriculum.”
(McNamara, 1990, p. 150)

He claimed that it was easy to discuss what to do in the classroom, but not so easy to act on the conclusions formed. In fact, there is no easy distinction between thought and action. Thought and action are intertwined.

Criticism concerning the omission of the affective dimension, found in Schon (1983), led to the examination of reflection in action and knowledge in action. Schon claimed that good professionals do not rely on formulae but on what he called a kind of learned improvisation. In this way, applying formulae to drama lessons and in particular drama assessment may well place false boundaries around, as well as omitting important aspects of, the subject.

Similarly, Brown et al. (1989) challenge the assumption that conceptual knowledge can be abstracted from the situations in which it is learned and

used. In this way Drama is a product of the 'activity, context and culture in which it is developed and used' (Brown et al., 1989, p. 32). A development of this idea is that one teacher's beliefs about what is appropriate teaching in drama would generate a very different outcome from another's. However, this idea of knowledge in action is entirely appropriate for the Drama classroom with its re-working and re-defining of key ideas and concepts.

Shulman (1986a) goes on to divide teachers subject knowledge into three categories: subject matter content knowledge, which is concerned with facts; pedagogical content knowledge, which is the body of knowledge specific to particular subject matter and curricular knowledge, knowledge of the resources available. The highly individual content of specific subject knowledge (in English) is investigated in Grossman (1987). Indeed, research has found that student teachers spend a great deal of the first two years of teaching developing their own subject knowledge. Grossman (1990) divides pedagogical content knowledge into four categories: conceptions of purposes for teaching subject matter; knowledge of students' understanding; curricular knowledge and knowledge of instructional strategies. Such knowledge is gained in teacher training, but without its value always being recognised.

There is an assumption behind Shulman's and Grossman's thinking of a transmission model. Those who question this view adopt a more sociocognitive approach. For example Sockett, (1987) who claims that Shulman ignores context and is assessment driven. "Thus measurable standards are the driving force" (Sockett, 1987, p. 215). He also claims that Shulman's model of teaching knowledge is merely technique, which ignores the tacit and the moral aspect as well as an understanding of how professionals think in action.

As in any subject, drama has specific terms, which need to be taught. e.g. 'thought tracking,' 'freeze framing,' or 'hot seating.' For as Vygotsky (1978) says, language structures and directs thinking and concept formation and is a product of social experience. This can be achieved within the ethos of the collaborative, sociocognitive classroom described by Heathcote. As she says, in the drama classroom:

“There is never any acting involved. It is more a matter of taking up an attitude, a way of looking at a situation and being involved with it” (Johnson and O’Neill, 1984 p. 172)

The activities draw upon existing experience and draw on emotional integrity. The agreement to live through the dramatic playing is part of the contract that has to be made between students and teachers.

Wubbels (1992) suggested that different teaching approaches would affect access to a pedagogical knowledge base and also discussed the gap between theory and practice in teacher training. For him this gap arose because training programmes, with their logical form of language, do not influence the trainee’s preconceptions or ‘world images’, which need to be influenced by imagery and metaphor.

“Student teachers often think that the real job of the teacher is to explain things clearly and for years and years they have experienced this when they were students themselves.” (Wubbels, 1992, p. 140)

The answer was a shift in focus from the cognitive to the affective

“An invitation to concentrate on one’s emotions instead of one’s cognitions is a conventional form of a technique to put someone in touch with world images.” (Wubbels, 1992, p. 145)

Marks (1990) developed the idea that content knowledge comes from various sources including pedagogy itself, and McNamara (1991) pointed out that pedagogical content knowledge is not a distinct category but is inextricable from content knowledge itself:

“There has been a tendency to investigate and analyse teaching and learning as generic activities without reference to the subject knowledge which provides the

substantive content for most lessons.” (McNamara, 1991, p. 113)

Other studies which indicate a variety of past experiences that can influence a student teacher’s understanding of a subject include: Wilcox et al. (1990) and McDiarmid (1993). Hornbrook (1991) would contend that it is the job of the teacher to provide a content base and a context for drama. Teachers, who advocate Heathcote’s DIE theories, do not help themselves or other teachers by offering no view on assessment. Hornbrook provides context in the shape of text, theatre and dramatic form, and by regarding drama as a craft, he provides the teachers/examiners with a product to assess. For the drama teacher, lack of confidence in subject matter is a serious issue.

Perspectives on Assessment

The practice of assessment in England and Wales has traditionally been reliant on ‘norm-based’ forms of assessment where one student’s performance is measured against that of other students. Drama teaching increases awareness of problems inherent in such traditional forms of assessment. Such tests

“are based on a concept of ‘ability’ as a stable or static characteristic within the individual which will to a substantial extent determine future learning.” (Lunt, 1993 p. 148)

This is incompatible with drama where the process of learning assumes the organic/developmental nature of students’ ability. The behavioural school of thought with its emphasis on the ‘test’ is primarily summative in approach. There is a need to ‘pass’ in behavioural assessment before going on to the next stage. The idea of ‘passing’ is not generally used by drama practitioners, until it is required at GCSE. In the behavioural model, the tasks set up for the test are usually isolated and artificial, so student and teacher expectations can differ considerably.

One of the main debates in assessment generally is whether its purpose should be as an element in supporting learning, or as part of classroom interaction or, as a certification device, a tool for providing parents with

information about their child's progress, or part of the evaluation of teacher or school performance. There is a definite move by central government towards using assessment for accountability purposes, measured through the publication of aggregated tests and national examination results which are then used to draw up league tables showing schools' comparative positions and ostensibly their performance. This inevitably strengthens the role of summative assessment. The student is given a level of attainment but no information is provided about the student's learning process or social or interactional features which are central to drama education. There is no how? or why? No qualitative information is provided about students' future needs for learning. For curriculum-based assessment, the aim is to establish accurately what the child can or cannot do on her own. This places National Curriculum testing more within the area of the behaviourist model of assessment, which does not rest easily with drama, which is concerned with the how and the why.

The cognitive approach is also based on the 'test', often in the form of essay questions. The whole emphasis in the nature of drama teaching is that it is 'action'. Despite the fact that there are some formative elements in this learning theory e.g. the feedback on students' essays, continuous assessment and recorded marks, the idea of drama as action does not sit well with assessment in the form of essay questions. The tension between formative and summative assessment in drama is influenced by the nature of GCSE drama, which has shifted its emphasis from action to the written paper. Earlier work by Gipps (Gipps and Stobart, 1993), first published in the early days of the National Curriculum and before full National Curriculum assessment was phased in, was written as a guide for teachers coming to terms with a national assessment system. The work challenged the assumption that assessment can be reduced to testing which, in itself, was claimed would raise standards.

Harlen and James (1997) suggest that formative and summative purposes of assessment have become confused in practice and that as a result assessment fails to have a formative role in learning – particularly learning with understanding. Requirements of assessment for formative and summative purposes differ. Harlen and James (1997) challenge the assumption that summative judgements can be formed by simple aggregation of formative

ones. Instead, they propose alternative approaches, which involve identifying next steps in learning, accessing pupils' ideas, and self-assessment. Not only is this closely related to Vygotskian thinking, particularly the Zone of Proximal Development, but it also relates to the distinction drama teachers have to make between formative and summative assessment. Herman et al. (1997) examined alternative assessment in practice in the U.S. and looked at student attitudes and approaches. They asked if students find alternative assessments to be more motivating and interesting than traditional type tests. These forms of assessment, though time consuming, were generally regarded favourably by the students. The idea of the process of assessment as a motivating force is an interesting one, but it is not an idea followed in cognitive thinking with its emphasis on the final outcome or product.

Within sociocognitive theory there is the idea of more than one kind of assessment, i.e. both self-assessment and peer assessment. Assessment is regarded as more 'dynamic.' This idea of dynamic assessment

“derives substantially either explicitly or implicitly from the theoretical formulations of Vygotsky”

and

“has the potential to overcome some of the problems inherent in traditional static forms of assessment.” (Lunt, 1993, p. 145)

Such procedures

“involve a dynamic interactional exploration of a learner's thinking *processes* and aim to investigate a learner's strategies for learning and ways in which these may be extended or enhanced.” (Lunt, 1993, p. 152)

Just as happens in the drama classroom, the emphasis is more on the formative elements and tends to be continuous and perhaps on occasions more informal. With this model, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development is central to the process of development and the role of adult mediation. Here, assessment can take the form of group work tasks and process

orientated tasks. An attempt by Gipps (1994) to pull together the wide range of assessment tasks used in schools from the early 1990s and from them, to develop a theory of assessment, highlights the contrasting agendas between those who want to achieve greater accountability in school performance, largely government agencies and those who see assessments' purpose as improving pupil learning, the view of many teachers.

Assessment is generally regarded as an estimate of the quality of a student's work, a summative process involving measurement and gradation. Burgess and Gaudry (1985) do not consider this sufficient for the arts, especially drama

“Arts Education encourages individual creative responses and needs an appropriate assessment methodology that genuinely reflects the expressive and creative dimensions of art... However, assessing what has been learnt by the child in this artistic experiencing has been problematic for teachers within the traditional assessment mode that predominates in U.K. schools” (Ross et al. 1993, p. 9)

The case is argued for teachers to make time to sit down with individual students to talk to them about their work and help them weigh up their own achievements. The voice of the student is central, with subjectivity having a role. However there is a risk with this method that oracy could well take the place of literacy. The pupil might not have the oral skills any more than the literary skills. The process/product debate is present too:

“Hitherto the arts have all too often been assessed from an external point of view as products. It is our belief that for the arts such assessment is neither sufficient nor satisfactory since it avoids that which is most to be valued in arts learning: the subjective making of aesthetic meaning.” (Ross et al. 1993, p. 167)

Emphasis on creativity in drama is not without its dangers. Working from text can be seen as an inferior activity, which involves an engagement with second-hand ideas.

“Implicit in this view was the notion that responding to the written word was not itself a creative act.” (Fleming, 1994, p. 105)

However this is to use the word ‘text’ (as it has been used hitherto in this chapter) in the narrowest sense of a play script. Cliff Hodges et al. (2000) in attempting to define the subject of English, identified ‘texts and language’ as the core concerns of the subject. However, the difference with drama is that the ‘text’ need not be written.

“We have been encouraging our students to consider the idea that everything they see, hear or read can be thought of as a text.” (Campbell, 1999, p. 14)

Kempe and Nicholson (2001) also emphasize drama’s aesthetic dimension and would concur with Ross et al. (1993) that how the student learns is as important as what the student learns. There is a case for prospective rather than retrospective assessment in the arts. Learning does not proceed in a simple straight linear fashion and

“Any attempt to isolate ability in drama from learning through drama is likely to result in pupils reaching a low ceiling of achievement because of the failure to engage with content.” (Fleming, 1994, p. 139)

Again, this assumes a process-led, rather than a product-dominated approach.

Similarly Torrance (1995) writes of how curriculum developers have realised that real change will not take place in schools if traditional paper-and-pencil tests, be they essay or multiple choice, remain unchanged and

exert a constraining influence on how teachers and pupils approach new curricula. He writes that ‘authentic assessment’ tasks should

“be more practical, realistic and challenging than what one might call ‘traditional paper-and-pencil tests’ (Torrance, 1995, p. 1)

He puts forward the idea of ‘performance assessment’ and claims that by broadening the scope of the assessment system and increasing the complexity and the demands of the tasks involved, the curriculum will be broadened and the standard of teaching raised. Similarly, Harland (2000) in his research on the effects and effectiveness of secondary schools arts education, examines the case for assessment in the arts to focus on a wider range of effects and outcomes and the need to

“recruit and train teachers with specialist expertise in the arts.” (Harland, 2000, p. 571)

Collins (1992) in his survey of students studying drama within English lessons, also made this point that English teachers are not necessarily equipped to teach drama, which leads to some English teachers avoiding taking an active role in drama lessons. He also makes a plea for specialist teachers of drama.

Assessment could then take account of higher-order skills and competencies such as problem solving, investigation and analysis, following Vygotsky, and involve far more ‘authentic’ or realistic tasks than have traditionally been employed in the field.

Valencia (1998) develops this theme showing how it is undesirable for assessment to drive the curriculum, but at the same time not wanting assessment to have no influence at all. In fact, assessment needs to be “integrated into classroom life” (Valencia, 1998, p. 3) Because classroom-based assessment grows out of classroom work, focuses on individual students and feeds back directly to teachers and students, it is most likely to improve teaching and learning. As well as being a good fit for the drama

classroom, there are echoes of Ross et al (1993) as Valencia claims self-assessment as an integral part of teaching and learning and looks for a “shared, action oriented assessment tool” (Valencia, 1998, p. 28) In this way Valencia’s argument also follows Vygotsky:

“For Vygotsky, instruction is at the heart of learning and plays a central and leading role in development.” (Lunt, 1993 p. 155) and “instruction is only useful when it moves ahead of development. When it does, it impels or awakens a whole series of functions that are in a state of maturation lying in the zone of proximal development.” (Vygotsky, 1987 p. 212)

Treacher (1989) talks about the instinctive judgement (the sense of ‘rightness’ in students’ work) backed up by years of teaching experience. However, this view contains the obvious flaw that such experience cannot be applied by the newly qualified teacher. Treacher also continues the product/process debate for he feels that where assessment ‘fails’ is in not emphasising sufficiently the personal development and growth of the individual. Instead, there has been too much concern with presentations and plays (product). Treacher asks what are the tools for assessing inter-personal and inter-active skills? In his research, he initiated a process of negotiating with pupils from within the drama experience. This meant, in practice, that the class took more of the decisions about their work. Although Treacher’s methods allowed him to stand back from the class and observe more closely, there was still no clear definition offered of exactly what was being assessed.

In a healing response to the old divisions of Theatre and drama, Fleming (2001) makes the case for an integrated approach to the teaching of drama. He suggests an incorporation of content and form but acknowledges that,

“What some writers see as ‘consensus’ and ‘inclusion’ may be interpreted by others as a concession to mediocrity and banality through an abandonment of all the positive developments that took place in the 1970s and 1980s when

beliefs about drama teaching were held with passion and conviction.” (Fleming, 2001, p. 4)

With regard to assessment, Fleming asserts that

“national testing of highly dubious validity has replaced the professional sharing of judgements which belonged to a more formative system.” (Fleming, 2001, p. 4)

He goes on to claim that

“Drama teaching does not sit easily with orderly schemes of progression and assessment but neither can it exist outside the prevailing norms and expectations in education.” (Fleming, 2001, p. 148)

Because most writing about drama is concerned with the art form itself and not necessarily, how it can make a suitable school subject, within the parameters of the National Curriculum, writing and research about drama has concentrated on its content and delivery but not assessment. Where assessment is mentioned, it is usually to indicate how conventional methods of assessment are inappropriate for drama. The only clear voice in the area of drama assessment, therefore, is Hornbrook (1989), with his view that drama is a craft and that there is an end product to be assessed. General theories of learning and assessment are well documented but specific, empirical research on drama and assessment is limited. However, this research aims to explore drama practitioners’ perspectives on the content and teaching of drama and the relationship of drama to theories of learning.

The lack of empirical research on assessment in drama may well be a result of the absence of definition of content. Placing drama within English in the National Curriculum and treating the subject under oral skills in Key Stage Three does give the teacher something more concrete to assess. Similarly, with Key Stage Four, pinning down the subject under technical or theatre skills and having written work to mark could simplify assessment for both teachers and examiners. Yet this would only be in a very narrow sense,

which leaves out much of what the theorists cited actually believe drama to be about.

Conclusion

From the literature review, it is apparent that there is considerable congruence between sociocognitive theory on the one hand and drama theory and practice on the other. After considering learning theory and the views of major theorists in the field, as discussed by leading practitioners, it appears that drama is located within the sociocognitive tradition of learning. At least it was before the advent of the National Curriculum. However, in looking at the assessment literature, although there is abundant general evidence on the importance of formative procedures, there is a lack of assessment literature specific either to drama or to practical subjects in general in English schools. Therefore, although the drama theories of the major theorists espoused before the National Curriculum, seem to reflect a sociocognitive orientation to assessment there is no specific written evidence outside of the older (1980s) GCSE syllabuses.

The developments in Drama-In-Education since the 1950s were dominated by a strong reaction against the tradition of play reading and play-acting by students. This took the form of a struggle for recognition of the educational potential of drama that goes beyond the skills of theatre or performing to an audience and beyond its use as a social function for the community. This paralleled the general move in education theory away from information processing theories to a more cognitive approach.

When Peter Slade (1954) wrote *Child Drama* he rationalised the dichotomy with his view of drama as dramatic play, which children fell into when left with unframed material. The role for the teacher was loose. Drama at this stage was fairly new and only reached some kind of acceptance in the teaching community in the 1960s. There was still no clear description of drama and the HMI Drama Survey (1968) left the definition to the drama teachers. The problem was touched upon in the 1960s by the Plowden Report (1967) when the HMI John Allen wrote, “too many different activities were claimed by teachers to be drama” (The Plowden Report, 1967, p. 169). The first big change came in the 1970s with Dorothy

Heathcote's Drama-In-Education theories of Teacher-in-Role. However, assessment of the students work was never mentioned, and though Hornbrook began the challenge to the Drama-In-Education theories in the nineties the matter of assessment has not yet been investigated in depth.

The issue of what the content of drama lessons should be has raised strong feelings among practitioners, but the 'theatre/drama' divide remains a vexed question, as does the 'process/product' argument. There appears to be a need for some kind of coherence about definitions. What should be taught in drama lessons? How should it be delivered? Each subject area carries with it epistemological concerns and issues and some studies have reflected this, for example McDiarmid (1993) in Mathematics and Grossman (1987) in English. Not only do these studies show that teachers can have eclectic views on their subject but Elbaz (1983) also found that ideas could vary considerably about individual subjects, even from class to class. With one teacher holding the view that English was a literature based, creative medium for expression for one group of students whilst simultaneously holding the view that English was an academic exercise in linguistic rules for another. This problem is increased in drama where even fewer clear definitions exist.

It is clear that teachers' beliefs are extremely varied, shifting, reflect a multiplicity of experiences and owe little to pedagogic theory. Calderhead (1988) thinks that teachers often have fairly restricted views or simple accounts of the processes involved. For example, that teaching just equals personality plus a few tactics. Of course, the reality is more complex. Smith and Neale (1989) in their analysis of subject matter knowledge and beliefs, showed how beliefs are originally predominantly didactic or discovery-oriented and they spoke of the need to address both substantive and pedagogical content knowledge as well as beliefs about teaching in teacher training programmes. Discrepancies between teachers' beliefs and classroom practice were found by Galton et al. (1980) in their observational study where it was often seen that what some teachers said they believed about teaching was not reflected in their practice because, ultimately, their goal was to deliver the prescribed curriculum within a given timescale. This research, although conducted in the primary sector, was on a scale large

enough to yield perhaps more significant results than smaller ethnographic studies. Some researchers (Short and Short, 1989) have seen associations between teachers' beliefs and how they perceive situations in their own classroom. Others have reported inconsistencies between beliefs and planning work or teaching. Wilson and Wineberg (1988) show how subject backgrounds affect what is taught and highlight the association between teachers' beliefs and the way they perceive situations in their own classroom:

“Learning is not merely an encounter with new information, for new information is often no match for deeply held beliefs.”(Wilson and Wineberg, 1988)

Teachers can also hold contradictory beliefs, which can be used to justify conflicting actions in various different teaching contexts (Cornett, 1990). In the light of this claim, Freeman (1991b) speaks of how tacit beliefs and conceptions are made explicit through teacher education, but are also formed and refined through the process of professional training. It is important to make these implicit beliefs explicit. Sharing professional discourse is the answer in other words, familiarizing oneself with and thus using the ‘jargon.’ Sharing the language organizes the teachers’ thinking and generates control. Drama teachers are no different to other teachers in this respect.

Guskey’s (1986) simple model of the effect of staff development activities purports to show that changes in belief follow rather than precede changes in practice. His position is an optimistic one and he even argues against himself when he quotes (Bolster 1983, p. 298) that ideas and principles about teaching are believed to be true by teachers only ‘when they give rise to actions that work.’ This position is challenged by Richardson (1995) who claims that there is constant interaction between beliefs and practice and that change can come about by an alteration in either. However, fundamental changes in beliefs about teaching or subject are usually achieved over time, slowly, and with much support.

It is necessary for several questions to be investigated before teachers can know what they are assessing or how to assess. Assessment, which focuses on a child's actual level of attainment, is incomplete. To gain a complete picture, teachers need to assess in the zone of proximal development and this involves dynamic interaction. Assessment in creative arts is more problematic than in the 'core' subjects, particularly in the area of creativity, which is difficult to pin down to a formula. Whereas the definition of creativity in Cropley (2001) is novelty/effectiveness/ethicality; the definition of creativity in Beattie (2000) is one of trait/process/product. Creativity involves the body and mind and has characteristics of commitment and imagination. Beattie's (2000) conclusion is that creativity should be assessed, but using an appropriate methodology. A claim also made by Ross et al. (1993) Assessment therefore requires a particular matrix of trait/process/product plus 'field' and 'domain' and a panel of 'judges' (teachers, peers, professionals and students). This seems a rather unwieldy proposition for just one area of the school curriculum. The DfEE (1999b) takes a line closer to Cropley (2001) Their definition of creativity is:

“Imaginative activity fashioned so as to produce outcomes that are both original and of value.” (DfEE, 1999, p. 29)

but they admit that teachers are often unclear about which criteria to apply to students' creative work. The DfEE's (1999) conclusion, to be found in their recommendations, is that there should be a greater emphasis on formative assessment. They ask for the QCA to develop advice to teachers on formative assessment for creative teaching and learning.

Most of the research in the area of teachers' beliefs and in subject assessment is with reference to the core subjects of Mathematics, English and Science. Assessment of these is more practised and straightforward than assessment in practical subjects, unless the subject is a craft, where there is an end product. To date there are no qualitative surveys in Drama. However, Clark and Goode (1999) professed to offer a solution to the problem of assessment. Their work is dismissive of Hornbrook, calling his approach 'cultural conservationist' and a 'high art' model, and instead their orientation is towards the theories of Heathcote, Bolton and Neelands,

which they call the ‘orthodoxy.’ Drama content is therefore seen in terms of the ‘exploration and creation of personal values’ and an ‘intelligence of feeling.’ It is suggested that in assessing drama attention should be focussed on: personal, social and expressive skills, conceptual learning and dramatic art form. How this is supposed to happen is unclear, as Griffin (1996) says

“it is far easier to assess the degree to which pupils have mastered drama skills than it is to define the kind of learning related to content which has perhaps been the most far reaching learning experience for those who have participated in a drama lesson. (Griffin, 1996, p. 6)

Gardner (1983) from the vantage point of cognitive psychology advocates the idea that there are many intelligences common to all cultures each with its own pattern of development and including linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinaesthetic, interpersonal and intrapersonal

“...in the case of the actor or the performer, skill in personal intelligences – and also in many cases in musical or linguistic intelligence – is part and parcel of successful performance. Nearly all cultural roles exploit more than one intelligence; at the same time, no performance can come about simply through the exercise of a single intelligence.” (Gardner, 1983, p. 207)

Which raises the question is drama a multi-intelligence activity? Within drama, there appears to be no single capacity, measured numerically, or that can be measured by standardized instruments such as National Curriculum assessment. The concept of ‘field’ thus becomes important and also the notion of specialist teachers (Harland, 2000; Collins, 1992). This field

“includes the people institutions, award mechanisms and so forth that render judgements about the qualities of individual performances. To the extent that one is judged competent by the field, one is likely to become a successful practitioner; on the other hand, should the field

prove incapable of judging work, or should it judge the work as being deficient, then one's opportunity for achievement will be radically curtailed." (Gardner, 1983, page xxi)

In this way, English uses 'linguistic' intelligence but Drama includes at least 'bodily-kinaesthetic' intelligence and maybe more, according to the given definition of drama. Therefore, it appears that the assessment methods should vary accordingly and include an authentic performance assessment (Torrance, 1995)

The English National Curriculum, AT1 Speaking and Listening, (Appendix Two) appears to equate drama skills with oracy and the assessment is based on a 'correct' way of speaking using 'Standard English.' Thus, National Curriculum assessment tends to indicate a more behaviourist model. What is needed may well be some form of qualitative assessment of psychological processes, and an acknowledgement of the value of a teacher's intuitive/subjective judgement in the creative process, alongside the more conventional approaches for the more 'accessible' parts of the drama curriculum; plus an acknowledgement that how the student learns is as important as what they learn (Kempe and Nicholson, 2001; Fleming, 1994)

"It is a false hope to expect to establish completely objective criteria for describing progress and for assessment purposes; language is not precise enough an instrument to achieve that goal. What is needed is a sharing of subjective judgements as to what counts as quality of achievement in the subject." (Fleming, 1994, p. 139)

As we have seen, drama teaching has paralleled the shifts of approach that have occurred in teaching in general until, following Heathcote, the sociocognitive model was fully embraced. However, the National Curriculum's style of assessment fits more easily with Hornbrook's drama as craft model, as this method results in producing something measurable to assess. The questions raised from the review of literature include whether

teachers' beliefs lag behind sociocognitive theories of learning. Is the sociocognitive approach weak or absent amongst teachers generally, especially in the core subjects or are drama teachers the exception to this? Are drama teachers even aware of the approach they are using?

In conclusion, there is a need to investigate the following four questions:

1. Where do teachers stand on the debates of major theorists for the field with regard to the definition/content of drama teaching?
2. Do the views of teachers in the field reflect a behavioural, cognitive or sociocognitive approach to learning and assessment?
3. Which orientation to content, learning and assessment is reflected by the National Curriculum?
4. Is there a mismatch between the views embodied by the major theorists, teachers and the National Curriculum?

For the purposes of this research, it is necessary to examine the beliefs and views of the drama teachers themselves and whether there is a match between their perspectives on content, delivery and assessment in drama and those of the National Curriculum. To this end, the next chapter suggests a methodology for investigating these questions.

3. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the position of drama in secondary schools today, as there may be some confusion for teachers as to its position with regard to English and drama assessment objectives as specified in the National Curriculum. Drama is not regarded as a separate National Curriculum subject but comes under the aegis of English in Attainment Target 1, *Speaking and Listening*. This blurs the distinction between the subjects of drama and English which evolved during the 1960s through to the 1980s and impels the subjects back together again. This, taken together with the shift in assessment weighting in the GCSE examination during the 1990s away from the practical examination to the written paper, leaves the nature and position of drama in the curriculum in an undecided state for teachers of drama who may regard their subject as having separate core skills and knowledge from English.

As a result, I looked at the extent to which the new prescriptions of the English National Curriculum, *Speaking and Listening* (Attainment Target One) do or do not promote the curriculum objectives of drama, according to drama teachers and to understand the implications of the new assessment for participants. This study involved an investigation of the core skills and knowledge taught by schools and how these match the new methods of assessment. Part of this investigation also involved looking at the roles of teachers under the old system in comparison with how they work under the new provisions. As well as the teachers' perspectives, I explored the teaching of drama from a document analysis of the relevant sections of the English National Curriculum.

The significance of this research was to find out how teachers view the teaching of drama in relation to the introduction of the National Curriculum. It is important to know what teachers think about the changes placed on them. By virtue of their job, teachers are supposed to be the experts in their chosen field of study. The National Curriculum potentially placed changes before these teachers, which may have altered the content of what was being delivered. There may also be implications for the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (QCA) This government agency lays down the

curriculum objectives of each subject, and may be interested in knowing the attitudes of teachers delivering this particular subject. This research also explored the supposed distinction between drama and English, which may not be made clear by the English National Curriculum, *Speaking and Listening* Attainment Targets. That is whether drama has essential skills and knowledge of its own, which can only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English. In this way, teachers may begin to develop a clearer understanding of the purpose of teaching drama as a separate subject.

To explore the above, I decided to investigate the following questions:

1. Where do teachers stand on the debates of major theorists for the field with regard to the definition/content of drama teaching?
2. Do the views of teachers in the field reflect a behavioural, cognitive or sociocognitive approach to learning and assessment?
3. Which orientation to content, learning and assessment is reflected by the National Curriculum?
4. Is there a mismatch between the views embodied by the major theorists, teachers and the National Curriculum?

Research Design

The research was principally qualitative, comprising questionnaire and interview. However, some data obtained from the questionnaire could be summarized quantitatively. This method allowed me to discover the experiences, attitudes, beliefs and understandings of the teachers surveyed. It also provided raw data, which could be measured on a numerical basis. A fellow teaching professional from another discipline originally coded the document analysis of the English National Curriculum to provide a form of interrater reliability.

A broad approach in terms of area was taken for the questionnaire which was sent to all schools in East Anglia (Cambridge, Norfolk and Suffolk.)

This was an attempt to find out teachers' views on content, teaching and assessment of drama. The questionnaire revealed teachers' attitudes to the strands of the English Attainment Target One and the skills and knowledge required, and the interviews revealed what the drama teachers thought not only about drama's place in the National Curriculum but also about the GCSE syllabuses as well. This was an effort to find out what skills and knowledge were thought to be important for the subject of drama. It was also important to find out what the implications of the recent changes in the requirements for GCSE drama were for teachers in relation to pedagogy and assessment. This also revealed whether there was a mismatch of views between the teachers' perceptions and the requirements of the National Curriculum.

I elected to do this kind of research, namely qualitative, because the emphasis of this investigation is on teachers' experiences and their construction of meaning in their work. Teachers spent a lot of time describing their experiences and their beliefs. Much of the data consisted of what teachers said.

The use of the questionnaire in Study One gave me a wide range of respondents, in fact all 120 state secondary schools in East Anglia and was quick to administer. Every participant was asked the same questions, thus yielding quantifiable information, which informed the next stage of my research, the interview. I thought that interviews were an effective choice of methodology for what I was interested in learning because they allowed interaction with the participant and therefore provided for follow-up, clarification and more detailed analysis. Even though I knew the transcriptions would be time consuming and that responses might be coloured by the interviewees' perceptions of me and by how they wished to present themselves, I thought that this was the best research tool to access beliefs, which teachers might not have previously verbalised in any way.

The overall analysis was a mixture of qualitative and quantitative. Nevertheless, following Miles and Huberman (1994), greater emphasis was placed on qualitative analysis, as a deeper understanding of the process of

drama teaching was required than could be simply measured. This was an attempt to

‘...explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint... By making use of both quantitative and qualitative data.’ (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 233.)

There were three phases to this research: Pilot, Study One (questionnaire) and Study Two (interviews). In the following part of this methodology section, components are organized under the following sub-headings: ¹Aim and Design, ²Participants/Setting, ³Materials, and ⁴Procedures. Pilot Results, including discussion and implications for the next phase are included in this chapter as the results from the pilot are used to redesign materials for the subsequent questionnaire and interviews. Results and Discussion for studies One and Two are included in a separate chapter.

Figure 3:1 Participants, Settings and Materials

	<i>Settings and Participants</i>	<i>Materials</i>	<i>Circumstances</i>	<i>Date</i>
<u>Pilot</u>	2 state secondary schools 6 teachers	Questionnaire (31 items) Interviews	Return within 2 weeks 1 interview of 45 mins	March 1999 April 1999
<u>Study One</u>	120 state secondary schools (76 returns) East Anglia (Cambridge, Norfolk, Suffolk)	Questionnaire (30 items)	Return within 4 weeks	May 1999
<u>Study Two</u>	12 state secondary schools.12 HODs Average 13 years experience each. Cambridgeshire	Interviews	3 interviews of 45 minutes each	June-December. 1999

In order to supply background knowledge and provide some context, I have included a section on the National Curriculum. This is placed here so that the reader will be able to understand the answers from the respondents on the questions relating to the National Curriculum.

It is important to begin by considering the provenance of this document as it is not a piece of educational research. The English National Curriculum document was first published in 1985, but came into effect in 1988, as part of central government policy to provide clear direction on the content and assessment of English in secondary schools in England and Wales. In 1989, following the National Curriculum Council's Consultation Report on English, (NCC, 1989) there was further consultation and adjustments were made, as LEAs, Governing bodies and organizations representing teachers' views were sought. It was reviewed in 1999 with a new version to take effect from September 2000. No major changes have been incorporated in the new National Curriculum orders for English.

A working party of civil servants, teachers and lay personnel was established to draft the National Curriculum English document. The working party reported back to the Secretary of State. The working party's proposals were then published with the opportunity for interested parties, particularly teachers and subject associations, to comment. Next the final draft was approved by the Secretary of State and passed by parliament. As part of central government's intention to take control of the curriculum and the National Curriculum orders for each subject were legal and political statements as much as educational documents.

As a result, the English document, like all the National Curriculum subject documents, is a prescriptive statement, which schools are required to follow. This requirement is included in the job description of teachers. How effectively this is done is assessed by external means such as inspection by OFSTED, and by national Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs) at the end of Key Stage Three and through GSCE at the end of Key Stage Four.

Given that the English National Curriculum is a government publication, it is therefore not a document which lends itself to normal analysis and coding. The document overwhelmingly concentrates on English with drama appearing briefly as an adjunct to the main subject. Drama receives five lines of coverage, English fifty-two. In the NCC report on English (NCC, 1989) there is an acknowledgement that,

“It is recognised, however, that the elements of drama included in programmes of study and statements of attainment up to and including level 6 do not constitute the whole of drama.” (NCC, 1989, p. 20)

McGuinn (1995) notes that within the programmes of study, (Appendix Two) the idea that students should ‘participate’ is considered sufficient, there is no mention of teaching them to become more adept at drama. Bearing out this view is the fact that although drama is mentioned in the Programmes of Study, there are no level descriptors, which for all other subjects outline standards of achievement. With regard to OFSTED, the main reference to drama is contained within one paragraph:

“Drama has a place within English in the National Curriculum. Pupils’ achievements in drama should be judged according to their contribution to each of the Attainment Targets 1 to 3 for English. In addition, the National Curriculum recognises drama as a subject in its own right, particularly at Key Stage 4 where schools may offer it alongside the other arts. At all four Key Stages pupils’ achievements in drama should be judged within two main categories: creating and performing drama; and appreciating and appraising it.” (OFSTED, 1993, p 27)

With regard to assessment, OFSTED suggests that

“Standards should be judged in the following aspects of pupils’ achievements: using imagination, with belief and feeling; creating drama with conviction and concentration; responding sensitively to their own work and that of others in drama; using a range of dramatic skills, techniques, forms and conventions to express ideas and feelings effectively; grasping and using dramatic concepts appropriately; recalling, recording and evaluating their own work and that of others.” (OFSTED, 1993, p 27)

In a later OFSTED document, drama is included in the section '*English, Especially Literacy*'

“In drama you should evaluate pupils’ ability to create imaginary characters, situations and sequences of actions as well as their skill in adapting, improvising or improving their work. (OFSTED, 1998, p 20)

Furthermore, whilst fellow arts, music and art are foundation subjects, drama and dance are not

“thus implying that they are even less important than art or music.” (Harland, 2000, p. 568)

So the government’s principal (and powerful) inspection agency does not see drama as either a subject in its own right or as important as other arts.

The focus of Attainment Target One (*Speaking and Listening*) in the document is a description of the competencies and skills in *Speaking and Listening* which students are required to develop during Key stages 3 and 4. For example, the document begins by outlining which speaking skills students must cover, such as explanation, description, consideration of ideas, argument, and debate and persuasion.

The document also outlines the listening skills which children should master. These include the ability to listen both attentively and in silence, to distinguish between tone and undertone, and to notice ambiguities, vagueness and unsubstantiated statements.

As already stated, drama features only briefly in the document. Where it is mentioned (in section 1D) reference is made to the development of pupils communication skills and their ability to evaluate language use. There is also an injunction for pupils to be given opportunities ‘to participate in a wide range of drama activities’.

No rationale is provided for the document. However, its origins clearly lie in the concern of central government to establish control over the curriculum in schools by laying down what should be taught in each subject, especially in the core subjects of which English is one (together with Maths and Science). The implicit rationale would be that the content of English National Curriculum document represents what the central government considers to be necessary and appropriate in the teaching and learning of English for students aged 11-16. For central government, this would represent a matter of legitimate public concern.

The document was written for a predominantly, but not exclusively professional audience. This comprised teachers, advisors, inspectors, governors and parents. School governors (mainly lay members) are charged with the responsibility for seeing that the National Curriculum is implemented in schools (a responsibility normally delegated to the Head teacher). Information about what was actually taught in schools was to be made available to parents. In respect of opening up the curriculum to a wider audience, the English National Curriculum document has relevance as it reflects an issue of legitimate public concern i.e. what is taught in schools. The curriculum is no longer to be 'a secret garden' (Callaghan, 1976.)

Given the nature of the document as a government publication, no specific claims are made and no supporting evidence is adduced. The document does not refer to the results of the consultation processes which took place.

Pilot Study

Aim and Design

The aim and design of this pilot study was to access by questionnaire the views of a small number of teachers (6) about the English National Curriculum/Drama interface and to interview two of the respondents. This was an attempt to explore practicing teachers' beliefs about drama and its relationship to the National Curriculum and to relate their responses to the four key research questions. I also wanted to identify key issues that would lead to the subsequent design of the questionnaire. In addition, the pilot was

included to reveal any flaws in the methodology being used, which could subsequently be corrected.

Participants/Setting

Potential participants were contacted because the views of practising teachers were sought. As they were the people who taught the subject and carried out student assessment, it was necessary to find out how they felt and what they believed about all aspects of drama teaching. I also wanted to question teachers who had to make the transition from the old form of assessment to the new examination-led system. Therefore, six experienced drama teachers (average service 12 years) in two Cambridgeshire 11-16 state comprehensive schools were given a researcher-designed questionnaire. I was present when all six were filling in the questionnaire. These participants were members of the Cambridgeshire drama teachers' support group and were known to me personally and professionally, therefore I spoke to all six. This was an attempt to extract from them what they thought the questions were about. I later interviewed two in greater depth. These two were chosen in particular, as their responses to the questionnaire needed clarification or they had raised issues, which I had previously not considered, for example, criticism of the wording of some of the questions. They were also both Heads of Department, each with an average of twenty years teaching experience who, besides teaching the subject, ran and participated in courses for drama teachers and took part in a great deal of extra-curricular drama activity.

Materials

As I needed a basic survey of teachers from as wide an area as practically possible, I decided to use a questionnaire as one research instrument. Since this questionnaire would subsequently, in Study One, be sent to a large number of schools (120), I needed a quick survey with closed-ended questions which could be analysed easily and that yielded information, which was easily codifiable and straightforward to summarise for reporting and analysis. In particular, I wanted a survey of secondary schools, not just in Cambridgeshire, but the whole of East Anglia (Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire) so that the results would reflect more than just the possibly idiosyncratic views of one county. This meant that I had a basis for

describing “the nature of existing conditions” (Cohen and Manion, 1994). That is, whether drama teachers’ views did differ from the positions reflected in the National Curriculum. Therefore, a Likert-style scale seemed appropriate, for simplicity of scoring and for ease of summarising the data.

Using Cohen and Manion (1994), I designed a Likert-style survey. This was an attitude survey, which asks teachers to strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with a selection of statements related closely to the research questions. The questionnaire was in three sections following my four research questions. Section A contained 14 questions, Section B contained 8 questions and Section B contained 9 questions. (Appendix Eight)

Having gone through both my introduction and my review of the literature to date, I wanted to ensure that the research questions were clearly at the heart of the project and that they ran through everything I did, particularly the questionnaire. I therefore studied the text of my own work thoroughly and, as I read, listed all the issues that had been raised and appeared to be important. For example, the process/product and drama/theatre debates, whether drama has a specific content, the role of the teacher and what it means to assess students’ work. The questions were shown to a senior lecturer in Educational drama at Huntingdon College to ascertain whether the Likert-style questions mapped on to the research questions. In the light of her comments, I rephrased some questions. For example, I gave definitions of what I meant by ‘drama’ and ‘Theatre’ in a footnote (Appendix Eight) to facilitate ease of response to that particular question.

A questionnaire, though quick to administer, does allow respondents to consider their answers and, as it is given to many people simultaneously, it is not time consuming. A questionnaire also enables a large number of people to respond to exactly the same questions. The relatively large number of subjects would increase the likelihood of reliability of results since a more representative sample would be obtained. The questionnaire also generated a basis upon which to select individuals for the second, in depth interview study, which focused on fewer participants. For the pilot,

thirty-one questions were piloted with six experienced drama teachers in a nearby Cambridgeshire school.

Although I wanted research instruments that were easy to complete by the participants, I still needed a questionnaire of some length to cover all the research questions. Similarly, interview questions were decided upon which related to the four main research questions. (Appendix Three). The interviews were quite substantial to include all items which were of relevance and again to facilitate full coverage of the research questions.

I then grouped them, following Cohen and Manion, (1994), under the headings of my four research questions. The specific central aims therefore, were to:

- Obtain a description of secondary teachers' beliefs on the content, teaching and assessment of drama. (Research questions one and two)
- Find out what teachers thought that the English National Curriculum implied about the nature of knowledge/skills, teaching and assessment of drama. (Research question three)
- See whether there was a match between the teachers' perspectives on content, delivery and assessment of drama and the National Curriculum. (Research question four)

As well as considering the practical aspects of administration, following Henerson et al. (1987), I considered the issues of validity and reliability in relation to the questionnaire.

Validity

In attempting to measure attitudes or beliefs, there is a necessity to rely on inference and it must be born in mind that beliefs are only one of many factors influencing behaviour and therefore there is not always a match between belief and behaviour. This is one indication of a weakness which could prove a threat to validity. However, a questionnaire remains an appropriate instrument for measuring teachers' beliefs and attitudes if various steps are taken to ensure, as far as possible, that the questions are tapping into the required information.

The issue of whether the respondents were giving their true opinions rests on two things; firstly, whether all the respondents shared the same understanding of the questions and secondly, whether all the respondents would “express similar opinions on other measures of the same construct” (Gall et al., 1996). This point was partially dealt with by the fact that some Cambridgeshire teachers were questioned in more depth in the subsequent interviews. For, in order to establish the credibility of the questionnaire responses, it was necessary to interview a subset of the respondents (Cohen and Manion, 1994). This addressed some of the concerns about subjective interpretation of questions and whether the responses to the questionnaire were honest. This also enabled supplementary questions to be asked for clarification, but subjective interpretation is a definite limitation of this questionnaire and was accepted as such.

However, although there were different views on what drama consisted of, the construct validity (Henerson, 1987) of this questionnaire was dependent on the respondents understanding the basic definition of ‘National Curriculum’ which all of the teachers were familiar with and which lent credence to their answers. The content validity (Henerson, 1987) was provided by giving appropriate weighting in questions to the various components of the four research questions and the concurrent validity (Henerson, 1987) was provided by the subsequent interviews.

Reliability

It was important to ascertain whether the questionnaire had been completed reliably by the respondents. This issue was partially addressed by the fact that the Cambridgeshire teachers were able to revisit and expand on earlier answers by the subsequent interviews which arose out of the East Anglian survey. I was then able to see concurrence or divergence of answers between the two sets of responses.

Consistency of the questionnaire was also a limitation. i.e. how likely it was that on repeated administration with the same subjects the same results would obtain. In order to establish the credibility of my interpretation of the questionnaire responses it was necessary to interview a subset of the respondents (Cohen and Manion, 1994). Member checking took place after

the follow up interviews as a check for reliability. This was to ensure that, given the identical questions again, the same results would obtain. The member checking took place a month after the questionnaire was administered. This amount of time was chosen so that the respondents did not remember too much from the first time, but was still soon enough to prevent any new initiatives taking place which would change the original conditions. There could also have been random effects, respondents ticking carelessly or suchlike, but participants tended to broadly agree with their original answers which lent further credence to the responses.

Procedures

My original method was a mixture of questionnaire and interview. After, seeking permission in December 1998 from the respective head teachers of my two sample schools I began to administer the pilot. Firstly, I administered the questionnaire, in February 1999, to six teachers in two state secondary schools and after the results came back at the end of the two week period in March 1999.

In April 1999, I conducted the interviews with two of the teachers who were both Heads of Department. (Originally, I interviewed three, but one did not yield pertinent information, see below.) The interviews were conducted at the end of the school day, on site, in a quiet room and lasted for forty-five minutes each.

Results of Questionnaire Pilot

The questionnaire was handed back to me by each of the six participants, well within the two-week deadline of March 1999 and I asked at this stage if there were any points on the questionnaire that needed clarification or whether the participants thought that any questions needed re-phrasing. Following this feedback, I made changes to six of the questions (Appendix Four). A glossary of terms used is provided in Appendix Five. The data were coded by totalling the responses to each question in turn and presenting them in the form of a table (below)

Figure 3.2: Results of Questionnaire Pilot

<u>Section A</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The long-term aim of drama teaching is for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live.		4	2	
2. Physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations is dramatic activity.	4	2		
3. Active involvement and identification with a fictitious situation is unique to drama	2	2	2	
4. The most important aim of drama teaching is for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama.		2	4	
5. Drama is a separate subject from Theatre.		4	2	
6. Drama GCSE syllabuses should include Theatre Skills			2	4
7. A drama teacher should enable the student to create his or her own answers to problems.	6			
8. One of the most important roles of the drama teacher is to help students understand themselves and the world in which they live.	3	3		
9. Drama is an art form.	4	2		
10. Assessment in drama should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills.	2	4		
11. Assessment in drama should test performance skills.	2	4		
12. Assessment in drama should test English skills.			4	2
13. Assessment in drama should include technical theatre skills (lighting, costume, set design etc.)		5	1	
14. Assessment in drama should be primarily formative (Diagnostic to enable further learning.)		6		
15. Assessment in drama should be primarily summative. (Specific task for recording performance at a particular time.)			6	

Figure 3.3: Results of Questionnaire Pilot

<u>Section B</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The National Curriculum rightly promotes the curriculum objectives of both drama and English (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>)			2	4
2. The shift in assessment weighting in GCSE drama from the practical to the written is a good thing.			4	2
3. The National Curriculum has caused the distinction between drama and English to become blurred because the two subjects are regarded as one.	4	2		
4. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) promotes curriculum objectives, which are specifically related to drama.			4	2
5. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) ignores curriculum objectives which are specifically related to drama,	4	2		
6. The objectives of English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) are general and could be applied to almost any National Curriculum subject.	2	4		
7. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) makes the assessment of drama easier for teachers because of the specific objectives.			4	2
8. I do not agree with the equation of English oral skills with drama skills in <i>Speaking and Listening</i> .	2	2	2	

Figure 3.4: Results of Questionnaire Pilot

<u>Section C</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Drama can only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English.	6			
2. Drama has separate core skills and knowledge from English.	6			
3. I am confused about what English and drama assessment objectives require.	3	2	1	
4. I find the specific objectives of the National Curriculum helpful in planning my lessons.			2	4
5. I find myself too limited by the objectives of the National Curriculum.	4	2		
6. I prefer teaching drama now, after the introduction of the National Curriculum.			4	2
7. Having written work to mark helps my overall assessment of the student.			4	2
8. Assessing a student purely on practical work is not sufficient for a full consideration of their drama skills.			2	4
9. Assessment in drama should be focused on the process of the students' work and not the product.		3*	3*	

* Including many notes in the margin.

Agreement

In the questionnaire, the firmest response came to question 7 where all six respondents strongly agreed that a drama teacher should enable the students to create his or her own answers to problems. Further agreement was found amongst teachers with regard to content in that physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations was regarded as dramatic activity and that drama was an art form. It was also felt that one of the most important roles of the drama teacher was to help students understand the world in which they live. The participants agreed that assessment in drama should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills, test performance skills and should be primarily formative.

There was agreement that the National Curriculum had caused the distinction between drama and English to become blurred and that Attainment Target One, *Speaking and Listening*, ignores objectives which are specifically related to drama. It was also agreed that the objectives of the Attainment Target were general and could be applied to almost any National Curriculum subject.

There was strong agreement that drama can only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English and that drama has separate core skills and knowledge from English. Teachers also agreed that they felt themselves to be too limited by the objectives of the National Curriculum.

Disagreement

Participants did not think that assessment should be primarily summative and also did not think that assessment in drama should test English skills.

The participants disagreed that the National Curriculum rightly promoted the curriculum objectives of both drama and English or promoted curriculum objectives that were specifically related to drama. They also disagreed that assessment of drama was made easier because of the specific objectives.

Participants also disagreed that the specific objectives of the National Curriculum were helpful in planning their lessons or that they preferred teaching now, after the National Curriculum, to teaching before its introduction. They disagreed that having written work to mark helped with the overall assessment of the student and they disagreed that assessing a student purely on practical work was not sufficient for a full consideration of their skills.

Mixed Response

There was a mixed response as to whether active involvement and identification with a fictitious situation was unique to drama or whether *the* long-term aim of drama teaching was for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live. There was also a varied response as to whether drama was a separate subject from Theatre. Similarly, it was unclear as to whether the most important aim of drama teaching was for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama. Participants thought that GCSE syllabuses should not include Theatre Skills, but then interestingly thought that *assessment* should include technical theatre skills.

There was a mixed response to the equation of English oral skills with drama skills in the National Curriculum.

There was a split response, 50-50, as to whether assessment should be focused on the process of the students' work and not the product. Many participants made extra comments on this question in the margin. For example: "It's difficult to respond to this in a tick-box way. I want to explain more fully." or "Depends which part of the syllabus you are teaching." There was also a certain amount of confusion about what the English and drama assessment objectives required.

Discussion

Given that the sample for the pilot was very small, only six teachers, there was still some clarity of response with regard to agreement and disagreement on issues. However, the data were rather sparse for a full and proper explanation of how the results specifically relate to the research questions and literature. Because of this, the following discussion relates primarily to the changes needed for the next round of surveying to ensure that more useful data could be gathered. Where claims are made concerning teachers' views in the following sections, they are necessarily tentative and would require substantiation from the main studies. Indeed, in some cases the views were obtained from verbal feedback on the questionnaire rather than the questionnaire itself.

Definition/Content

Some teachers thought that active involvement and identification with a fictitious situation was not unique to drama, as this involvement was possible in English Literature. However, when I laid stress on the word 'active' in the feedback talks, those who had thought this changed their minds and suggested that I italicise the word 'active' in Study One for emphasis.

It was interesting to note that while questions one (*The long term aim of drama teaching is for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live*) and eight (*One of the most important roles of the drama teacher is to help students understand themselves and the world in which they live*) were very similar, they received different responses. This was because those who disagreed with question one were concerned about the use of the definite article, so this was changed to 'A' rather than 'The' and question eight was deleted. A similar change was made to question four (*The most important aim of drama teaching is for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama*) 'The most important aim...' was changed to 'An important aim....'

Teachers tend to regard drama as being an art form with separate core skills and knowledge from English and a subject content that involves 'active' (physical, emotional and intellectual) involvement and identification with a fictitious situation. This emphasis on the 'active' can be found in both the cognitive and the sociocognitive approaches.

Participants thought that the teacher should enable students to create their own solutions to problems and that one of the most important roles of the drama teacher was to help students understand the world in which they live. This again suggests either a cognitive or a sociocognitive approach.

In Section B confusion was caused by the possible double negative in question eight (*I do not agree with the equation of English oral skills with drama skills in Speaking and Listening*) 'I do not agree...' was therefore changed to 'I agree.....'

Teachers thought that the National Curriculum had caused the distinction between the subjects of English and drama to become blurred and that English Attainment Target One, *Speaking and Listening*, ignored objectives which were specifically related to drama. Teachers also thought that drama could only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English.

Theatre/Drama

In Section A, the set of responses which needed further clarification were the questions on 'theatre'. Participants did not want theatre skills to be part of GCSE drama, but apparently wanted assessment to include theatre skills. (see below)

In question five, to avoid too much variation of interpretation, a definition of the terms 'drama' and 'Theatre' was given.

Process/Product

In Section C, question nine raised the most issues. '*Assessment in drama should be focused on the process of the students' work and not the product.*' Five out of the six participants elaborated on or qualified their answers at the side of the questionnaire. This question had obviously not allowed for some of the participant's preferred responses. I did consider changing the question, but decided to retain it as it was yielding interesting information as it was. The 'product/process' debate continues to raise strong feelings, both ways.

Assessment

Feedback from the teachers suggested that although they did not necessarily want theatre skills to be on the syllabus, if they were there, they needed to be assessed.

The view was that assessment should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills, should test performance skills and should be primarily formative, indicated a sociocognitive approach in this area. Participants did not think that assessment in drama should test English skills.

Assessment of drama was not made easier by the specific objectives of the National Curriculum and teachers felt themselves to be limited by them. They did not feel that having written work to mark helped with the overall assessment of the student, a definite rejection of the essay-writing mode of the cognitive approach. Participants also thought that assessing a student on practical work was sufficient for a full consideration of their skills.

Some questions, particularly the process/product question (C9) prompted participants to come and talk to me, as they were keen to elaborate on their answers and discuss the issues. The limitations of the use of the questionnaire became apparent. Clearly there was the danger of different interpretations of the same questions. The participants on the pilot wanted to talk to me about their responses to make sure both that they had understood the questions and that I had understood their responses. Whilst it was possible for six colleagues to talk to me about their responses and make requests (e.g. for a copy of the National Curriculum, English document), it was not going to be possible for 120 people to do so.

With regard to the above, I made whatever changes to the questions seemed sensible for purposes of clarity. Many questions required knowledge of the National Curriculum and two of the participants asked me for a copy of the English National Curriculum, AT1 *Speaking and Listening*. I therefore, included the relevant pages with all the questionnaires in Study One.

From the evidence above it appeared that the key research questions could yield pertinent information and therefore it was reasonable to widen the research to include a greater sample.

However, this experience further confirmed the belief that in-depth interviews were necessary for a full picture as it was necessary to give some participants a chance to respond to more open-ended questions.

Interviews

My second and potentially main instrument was a series of interviews. I thought that in an interview situation I could clarify any terms or questions that needed illuminating and also judge whether the respondents understood

the questions. Interviews would also provide the opportunity to respond to fresh ideas which might arise in the course of the interview. A face-to-face situation also provided an opportunity of gauging strength of feeling of responses.

I also thought that interviews would secure a more in-depth response than a questionnaire alone might. Interviews in addition have a better 'return rate' than a questionnaire. As people are generally better at expressing their opinions orally, it also allowed me to probe issues in depth. Furthermore interviewing twelve teachers was likely to generate quite a lot of information which I thought would be useful. However, I am aware of the downside of interviews in that the information yielded is more difficult to codify and analyse as people's responses are fuller and longer.

The interview questions were fashioned according to the research questions, but refined in accordance with the questionnaire responses. The questions, following Seidman (1991), asked about teachers' past lives and experiences to see how they arrived at their present attitudes to drama teaching. The middle part of the interview dealt with their present experiences of drama teaching and the third part of the interview encouraged reflection on the meaning that drama teaching held for them (See Appendix Three). This type of phenomenological interviewing was particularly appropriate for drama, as drama by definition has an affective dimension. A more rigid, scientific approach would not have been appropriate in asking people to reflect and make meaning out of their experiences.

Although ideas for these initial questions arose out of the literature, they were very general and the responses covered a broad area. However, I did want a semi-structured interview rather than a purely conversational one. This was because, although I was looking for qualitative information and, allowing latitude for the respondents to give their own preferred responses, there were some factual questions I wanted to ask i.e. '*Do you teach other subjects?*' and secondly there were areas that I particularly wanted to explore. One of these was the relationship of drama to the National Curriculum, which may not have arisen spontaneously in conversation, as drama is not a discrete National curriculum subject at Key Stage Three.

Conducting interviews also provided triangulation for my research. In order to provide a check against being misled by either the questionnaires or the interviews, one set of information was checked against the other to judge the credibility of the data. However, greater confirmation was needed to ascertain the trustworthiness of the data.

Trustworthiness of Data

I addressed issues concerning the credibility of my data by using the 'naturalist's alternative trustworthiness criteria' (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 301) which advocates some techniques for determining credibility. For example, it was more likely that credible findings and interpretations would be produced because I have had a 'prolonged engagement' with the culture of English and Drama teaching. It was more a case of whether I could rise above my own preconceptions, which was something of which I was constantly aware. There was little time to actually build trust in the pilot interviews, but this was addressed in the main study when a series of interviews, rather than a single interview was used. It also occurred to me that the pilot might have been affected by whether my respondents thought that I had any management agenda of covert appraisal.

Another activity, which provided an external check on my enquiry process, was peer debriefing in the form of someone playing 'devil's advocate.' This helped me to remain aware of the methods and values that were underlying my research and assisted me in consideration of the next steps to take.

I did not feel that 'Negative Case Analysis', which Lincoln and Guba (1985) saw as analogous to statistical tests for qualitative data, was appropriate for this research. The object of this revision of a hypothesis with hindsight, until it accounts for all known cases, was too rigid a criterion. A hypothesis that would fit a reasonable number of cases, say 60%, would indicate acceptability to me, as credibility could be gained by citing such evidence.

To provide a direct test of the findings and my interpretations, Member Checking was carried out by showing the transcripts to the interviewees. This meant that they had the opportunity to correct any factual errors and

check that my interpretation of what was said was accurate. Sometimes even extra information was offered at this point.

With regard to Transferability

‘...the naturalist cannot specify the external validity for an inquiry; he or she can provide only the thick description necessary to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility.’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 316)

Thick description, would therefore, be the only provision for transferability.

Dependability was provided by the use of an inquiry auditor. This was a colleague from the English and Drama faculty of the Education department of the local university, who checked the data, results and interpretations and confirmed that the research was internally coherent. Dependability and confirmability were thus determined simultaneously.

Results of Interview Pilot

The interviews took place in each case at the end of the school day, after the teacher had had a suitable break, on a one-to-one basis in a quiet room. Each interview lasted forty-five minutes, was uninterrupted and the answers were recorded by my hand written notes. I did not use audiotape at this stage because I thought that an audiotape in a one-to-one situation would be intrusive and inhibit the responses of the interviewee.

They were asked firstly about their pedagogy i.e. how they had taught drama in the past, their current practice, and where they saw the subject going in the future. The teachers were co-operative. There were no organisational difficulties in arranging and conducting the interviews; one of the advantages of having a drama Teachers’ support group in the area.

With regard to the teachers’ perspectives on the content of drama teaching, both participants were rather vague and talked about teaching “social skills”

“self-confidence” “team-work” and “problem-solving”. Both said that they regarded their role as a teacher as that of a facilitator, “helping pupils find their own solutions” but they did also teach skills such as “drama conventions”. (For examples of drama conventions see Appendix Five.) Talk about assessment was almost entirely about GCSE and the “requirements of the syllabus”. Assessment further down the school in Key Stage Three was sometimes “in preparation for those who would go on to take GCSE drama” or to “provide a grade to go on the Record of Achievement.” Assessment seemed to centre around “effort” in lessons “co-operation” or “working with others”. The English National Curriculum was regarded as “nothing to do with us” by one, and another comment was “they are oral skills not drama skills”. Some key quotations are presented in Appendix Six.

Discussion of Results

Although the questionnaire yielded some useful information, the same cannot be said of the interviews. There was not sufficient time to answer every question in enough depth and the results did not yield enough information to work with in response to the key research questions. Some questions were inappropriate, e.g. *Where do you see yourself going in the future?* produced the answer ‘Nowhere’ or other frivolous replies. The original focus of the research still seemed appropriate but the interview questions themselves had to be substantially changed so that I could understand the interviewees’ perspective on learning. In particular, I needed to be able to address the three major models of learning; behavioural, cognitive and socio-cognitive. I also changed the format of the interviews to allow for a more in-depth response.

The idea of socially mediated learning was apparent from listening to these teachers, as they all laid stress on group work and teaching ‘in role.’ All intervened, after the student and or group had gone as far as they could unaided, indicating a sense of the zone of proximal development (even if it was not actually named as such by any of them), and teacher-in-role was used frequently as a framework for Vygotsky’s cognitive apprenticeship. The name of Heathcote was well known but the name of Hornbrook was

known by only one participant of this, admittedly small, sample. All interviewees taught both drama and theatre indicating, perhaps, a slight proclivity towards the Hornbrook view of drama teaching.

Social and educational issues are abstractions based on the concrete experiences of people. At the root of these in-depth interviews was an interest in understanding the experiences of drama teachers and the meaning they make of those experiences. I therefore felt that phenomenological interviewing, using open-ended questions, would allow the teachers to reconstruct their experiences. The interviews also needed to be longer because of this context setting. I decided to have three forty-five minute interviews, preferably with not more than a week between each one in order to maintain the flow.

Although the interviews allowed further exploration of the issues through interaction with the participants, they were extremely time consuming; writing up of scrawled notes especially so. There is also the consideration that participants were affected by their own perceptions of both the researcher and of what they thought the research was for. Using friends was difficult, participants could be so keen to please, that they were almost asking what response would be appropriate. "I'd like to help, what sort of thing would you like me to say?" I would not use friends for the next phase. It should be noted that this was also a very small sample.

In the pilot, I made the mistake of interviewing a member of staff who had only been teaching for two years and who obviously could not comment on past practice in drama teaching. Although this gave me a viewpoint on what a young teacher felt that drama teaching should be about, I learned the need to find out about the teaching experience of each interviewee. As I was exploring the relationship of drama teaching to the National Curriculum, it was important to speak to teachers who were familiar with drama teaching before the National Curriculum. The other two participants were experienced teachers who fulfilled this criterion. In the next stage, I asked participants to indicate their length of service (Appendix Seven).

From the limited response received so far, there were some indications that there may be a mismatch between teachers' perceptions and those implied by the National Curriculum. Examples include the view that the National Curriculum was limiting to drama teachers, and that English had different core skills from drama, and that the National Curriculum blurred the distinction between the subjects. However, a greater sample was needed as information was lacking in the areas of process/product, where participants wanted to elaborate on their answers; and also with regard to the theatre/drama divide, where answers could appear ambivalent.

It would seem that clearer definitions of certain terms might be helpful; especially 'drama' and 'theatre.' A shared understanding of how these terms are used by teachers could also be useful. Results of such a study would then be valuable to other practitioners in the field as they seek to work with the National Curriculum and use assessment effectively within their teaching subjects as well as for those who make decisions regarding the content of the National Curriculum. Here I am referring to the officers at the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, (QCA) who advise government ministers and Department of Education and skills civil servants.

In the next section, a greater sample of teachers were surveyed by questionnaire and a larger number of teachers interviewed in more depth using the knowledge gained from the pilots.

Study One, Questionnaire

After the relevant adjustments were made based on the pilot the questionnaire was sent to all schools in East Anglia (Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk). This approach facilitated an exploration of my key research questions first, before more in-depth responses were sought in the form of interviews. Ideas of what was interesting to explore further were raised by this approach. It was also useful to have my initial assessment of whether teachers' views did differ from the National Curriculum confirmed by a wider sample.

Aim and Design

This second phase of the research took the form of an attitude survey. This method enabled me to discover the perspectives on the content, teaching and assessment of drama of a large number of teachers and helped towards providing an insight into the key question of whether teachers' attitudes do or do not concur with the perspective implied in the National Curriculum. It also provided data which could be analysed on a numerical basis.

Following the changes made after the pilot, I felt that I had avoided the pitfalls described by Cohen and Manion (1994) using negatives and complexities in my questions. Although the response rate was not what I had hoped for (at least 70%) the numbers were still reasonable (63.3%). 'A well planned postal survey should obtain at least a 40 percent response rate.' (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 98.) The response rate is an acknowledged limitation of a questionnaire and cannot be compared with the 100% response rate of interviews. On the danger of differing interpretations, though participants could not ask for clarification of questions they did feel free to put comments in the margin to amplify their responses where they felt that this was necessary. The comments were helpful and allowed, in some measure, for them to write their preferred response in some cases. This was particularly noticeable where the participant had strong feelings about a particular question.

Participants and Setting

I chose to conduct my research initially in East Anglia (Cambridgeshire, Norfolk and Suffolk), as this is where I live and work. I wrote to every state secondary school in these counties, including the Grant Maintained institutions. Secondary state educational organisation in these three counties differs considerably, which helped to give a broader perspective and cover many different types of drama provision in schools. This was an example of 'convenience sampling' (Cohen and Manion, 1994), choosing the nearest surrounding counties but it also gave me access to many existing contacts.

In Cambridgeshire, there is a distinction between provision in and around the city of Cambridge and that of the rest of the county. In Cambridge, secondary education organisation is based mainly on 11-16 schools (plus

one 11-18 institution) and three 16-18 Sixth Form colleges. In the rest of the county provision consists mainly of 11-18 schools.

In Norfolk, secondary education is provided through a mixed economy of 12-16 and 12-18 schools. With the age of transfer being 12, students' experience of secondary school drama, in Key Stage Three, is limited to two years rather than the usual three.

Suffolk has a system of mixed 13-18 upper schools. As they are admitted to secondary school at the age of 13, students' experience of drama in Key Stage Three, in this phase of their education, is confined to a single year.

Out of 120 schools surveyed, I received 76 replies, a response rate of just over 63%. There were 32 replies from Cambridgeshire, 20 from Norfolk and 24 from Suffolk. This was a fair spread over the three counties, which was important in terms of the generalizability of results, as not too many of the results would be concentrated in just one county. The participants were all Heads of Departments, though not all were heads of discrete drama departments. Some were Heads of English and drama and some were Heads of Expressive or Performing Arts faculties.

Heads of Drama	43	Teaching before the Nat. Curriculum	29
Heads of English and drama	20	Teaching before the Nat. Curriculum.	18
Heads of Perf/Expressive Arts	13	Teaching before the Nat. Curriculum.	10

Materials

I designed a questionnaire which went through several stages and was changed after the pilot. Those who had taken the time to respond to the questionnaire and had indicated on the attached form (Appendix Nine) that they were willing to take part in a follow up interview were in the first selection group. This was then narrowed down to Cambridgeshire Heads of Department and the final selection of twelve made from the information generated by the supplementary information for the questionnaire (Appendix Seven). This included such information as to whether they taught both relevant key stages, or had taught before the National Curriculum was introduced.

The guarantee of anonymity in Study Two, which I could not give in the pilot, may also have helped to produce more genuine responses.

Procedures

Letters requesting permission were sent to the Head Teachers of all state secondary schools in Cambridgeshire, asking if I could approach their Heads of English and drama for the purposes of research, with a pleasing number of positive replies received. One of the criteria was to try to obtain views from experienced teachers, preferably those who were teaching before the introduction of the National Curriculum. Although Heads of Department by definition will be experienced in most cases, I could not assume this; I needed to verify this point from the demographic information submitted with the questionnaire (Appendix Seven). This meant that the implications for change could be traced more successfully. Demographic information was missing from the original pilot. An extra page was added to the questionnaire asking for information on: age, gender, teaching experience, school and what key stages were taught. This information was used for further sub-analysis; see below in the Results and Discussion chapter.

I followed Cohen and Manion (1994) in interspersing questions throughout the survey to allow respondents to air their own views, rather than merely describe their practice e.g. *'I prefer teaching drama now, after the introduction of the National Curriculum.'* as well as removing the title from the questionnaire so as not to influence responses. (Originally, I had put the research title at the top of the questionnaire.)

A covering letter was sent (Appendix Nine) containing the aim of the survey, stressing its importance to the profession in the curriculum areas of both English and drama, assuring respondents of complete confidentiality and, hopefully, encouraging replies.

The questionnaires were returned to me by post by 76 out of the 120 schools, a response rate of just over 63%. The majority of the replies were immediate (returned within a week), and all 76 were returned before the end of May 1999, four weeks after dispatch.

Study Two: Interviews

The results from Study One, the questionnaire, were useful as responses to the four key research questions. Now I needed more detailed information on the issues concerned and also more information on the teaching and learning styles adopted by the respondents.

Aim and Design

This part of the research yielded qualitative data and took the form of a series of three interviews per teacher. This method enabled me to obtain a deeper understanding of Cambridgeshire drama teachers' views on the content, teaching and assessment of drama and their views on the English National Curriculum. It also provided information on the models of learning to which the teachers subscribed. The interview questions evolved from the responses to the questionnaire and from my own key research questions. The interviews themselves were extended from one to three sessions per teacher to allow more time for in-depth response. The information received from the questionnaire indicated to me that, to find out whether there was a match between the objectives of drama and the National Curriculum, I needed to know whether the individual teachers fell into any particular model of learning in their responses i.e. behaviourist, cognitive or sociocognitive. There were also questions that almost invariably invited the supplementary, for example C9, on whether drama teachers should be assessing the 'process' or the 'product', which produced such a mixed response and many extra notes in the margin. There was a clear need to explore such questions on a one-to-one basis, to draw out more information from the practising teachers.

Participants/Setting

These participants were a subset of individuals taken from the large survey in Study One. All teachers who were sent the questionnaire were asked in the introductory letter whether they would be prepared to take part in a follow-up interview (c.f. Appendix Nine) The selection of the twelve teachers chosen was based on three factors. Firstly, their willingness to take part, secondly, the fact of their working in a Cambridgeshire school, and thirdly whether they had been teaching before the introduction of the National Curriculum. An added factor was whether they had raised

interesting issues, for example in their supplementary margin notes or had made extra comments on the questionnaire which might merit closer examination.

The participants in this study were all Cambridgeshire teachers with at least eleven years teaching experience in state comprehensive schools who had taught drama before the introduction of the National Curriculum. All twelve teachers were Heads of Department and worked in state comprehensive secondary schools, either 11-16 or 11-18.

All the individuals cited have been given pseudonyms to protect the confidentiality of participants. There were eight females and four males, nine PGCEs, two Cert Eds. and one BEd. Nine teachers had gone straight into teaching from college. Three others had held other jobs before teaching. Two had worked in industry and one was a professional actor who later became a teacher.

All teachers interviewed taught drama at Key Stages Three and Four (three teachers taught at Key Stage Five also) Four teachers had timetables that were entirely drama. Four had timetables that were 70% drama and 30% English. One had 66% drama and 33% English. One had 87% drama and 13% English. The Youth leader, on half a teaching timetable taught 50% drama and 50% English and the Senior Teacher, also on a reduced teaching load taught 50% drama and 50% English.

There were eight discrete drama departments, two English and drama departments, a performing arts department and an expressive arts department. Eleven were Heads of Department, with one whose title was 'I/c Drama/Youth Leader' who worked also for the Community Education department in the school. None of the separate drama departments worked with the English departments in terms of coordinating schemes of work or assessment policies. The drama departments within larger faculties were integrated with the other arts subjects and/or English in terms of faculty policies.

With regard to demographic information the categories were: those who taught just drama, those who taught English as well as drama, Those who had other responsibilities, (especially management), those who were 30-40, those who were 40+ and men/women. This information was matched to the answers to ascertain whether there were any attitudes, which could be based on age, gender or experience.

Figure 3.5: Summary Information on Participants in Interviews

Number of Participants	Gender	Age Bracket	Title	Experience	Teaching Range
One	F	30-40	Head of Drama	11 years	11-18
Two	F	30-40	Head of Drama	13 years	11-18
Three	F	30-40	Head of Drama	16 years	11-18
Four	M	40-50	Head of English and Drama	25 years	11-16
Five	M	40-50	Head of Performing Arts	19 years	11-16
Six	M	40-50	Head of Drama	12	11-16
Seven	M	40-50	Head of Drama	20	11-16
Eight	F	30-40	Head of Expressive Arts	15	11-16
Nine	F	40-50	Head of English and Drama	22	11-16
Ten	M	30-40	I/C Drama Youth leader	15	11-16
Eleven	F	30-40	Head of Drama	12	11-16
Twelve	F	30-40	Head of Drama	11	11-16

Materials

On reflection, and after reading Seidman, (1991), I altered the pattern of the interviews for the main study to three for each teacher to make greater provision for reflection on their beliefs and experience and also because the

short interview did not yield much useful information. I also used a tape recorder to record the interviews. As well as having an accurate record of what was spoken, this also left me freer to concentrate on what was being said, and gave me less concern about keeping up with the note-taking. My original note taking, which was frenetic, was probably more intrusive and inhibiting than using a tape recorder. I then transcribed the tapes.

Following Seidman (1991) the first interview dealt with the context of their experience (past lives, early experiences in schools.), i.e. how they arrived at their present mind-set as a teacher of drama. The second interview allowed the participants to reconstruct details of experience within the context in which it occurs (present experience). The third interview encouraged participants to reflect on the meaning their experience held for them (intellectual and emotional, connections between life and work). What sense does drama make to them? Putting thoughts into words in this way made meaning for the teachers and thus, benefited my research.

After an introductory question, which was included to provide some context on the interviewee's experience as a drama teacher (an area which has subsequently been expanded), I asked several questions related to my overall research inquiry. I did not want to overwhelm the interviewee with too many questions and I did want to provide the opportunity to talk at length in response to each question. As I was not testing a hypothesis, it seemed appropriate to use a more inductive approach. The questions themselves (Appendix Ten) were deliberately brief, giving me the opportunity to follow up the response to each one with requests for elaboration or clarification, as necessary.

Procedures

I interviewed twelve teachers three times each in forty-five minute sessions. Firstly, I contacted the teachers by telephone to arrange dates and times. At the beginning of the first interview in each case, I told the participant what the research was about (drama teachers' perspectives on the teaching and assessment of drama) and guaranteed confidentiality. Following my difficulties in the pilot, simultaneously taking notes and concentrating on what was being said, I decided to audiotape the sessions and I asked the

participants if they minded being recorded. No one objected. The microphone was placed between us and directed at the interviewee. A short 'test' of equipment was given at the start to ensure that the audio taping was of a good quality. Each participant was offered the chance to read the transcript. They were also asked at the end of each interview if they wanted to make any further comments or had any questions for me about the research. I checked occasionally that the tape recorder was still recording. As all the participants were Heads of Departments, all the interviews took place in their respective offices at the end of the school day, after a short break. This second study yielded more detailed information on the key research questions, analysis of which is to be found in the next chapter.

4. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

This section contains the results and discussion of Study One, the questionnaire and Study Two, the interviews. Analysis of data will be mainly qualitative, but using some numbers for clarification of the questionnaire results. I decided to see whether teachers' beliefs fell into one of the three categories of learning discussed earlier, namely behavioural, cognitive or sociocognitive; or whether some teachers used a combination of approaches.

An examination of the changes in educational theory was necessary to explore how shifting theoretical approaches have impacted upon drama teaching. The three-part categorization of behaviourist, cognitive and sociocognitive was used to locate teachers' beliefs within the field of educational theory and to give structure to the comparison between the teachers' responses to learning and assessment and the National Curriculum. Although teachers do not always fit neatly into one category (Cornett, 1990) and beliefs can differ from practice (Galton et al., 1980) or even within aspects of one subject area (Elbaz, 1983), the three-part categorization was useful in providing a framework within which to work and to which the teachers surveyed could relate even if, as in several cases, they were not aware of where their practice was located theoretically (Calderhead, 1988). I was also looking for themes and patterns, which might emerge from the data, regarding the content, teaching and assessment of drama and its relationship to the National Curriculum.

The rationale behind the discussion was to use a descriptive approach, which explored teachers' beliefs, motivations and experiences and documenting matters from their perspective(s), thus giving teachers a voice. A qualitative approach, particularly in the interviews, seemed to be the most appropriate approach for highlighting beliefs and meanings, rather than behaviour.

Study One

Results

The data were coded by totalling the responses to each question in turn and presenting the totals in the form of a table. These sums were then converted to percentages, correct to one decimal place (See Fig.4.1 below). There were 13 questions which related to the assessment of drama, 16 which related to the content of drama and 15 which related to teaching of drama. Some questions covered more than one area.

Figure 4.1: Results of Study One - Questionnaire

<u>Section A</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. A long-term aim of drama teaching is for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live.	46 60.5%	27 35.5%	3 4%	
2. Physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations is dramatic activity.	47 62%	23 30%	6 8%	
3. <i>Active</i> involvement and identification with a fictitious situation is unique to drama.	63 83%	10 13%	3 4%	
4. An important aim of drama teaching is for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama.		59 77.5%	17 22.5%	
5. Drama is a separate subject from Theatre. *		48 63%	28 37%	
6. Drama GCSE syllabuses should include Theatre Skills.		33 43.5%	43 56.5%	
7. A drama teacher should enable the student to create his or her own answers to problems.	68 89.5%	8 10.5%		
8. Drama is an art form.	57 75%	19 25%		
9. Assessment in drama should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills.	20 26%	41 54%	15 20%	
10. Assessment in drama should test performance skills.	23 30.5%	37 48.5%	16 21%	
11. Assessment in drama should test English skills.		4 5%	41 54%	31 41%
12. Assessment in drama should include technical theatre skills (lighting, costume, set design etc.)		32 42%	38 50%	6 8%
13. Assessment in drama should be primarily formative (Diagnostic to enable further learning.)	17 22.5%	49 64.5%	10 13%	
14. Assessment in drama should be primarily summative. (Specific task for recording performance at a particular time.)		10 13%	51 67%	15 20%

* Where drama is defined as an active and imaginative engagement with some form of stimulus and Theatre is defined as the learning of performance and presentation skills.

Figure 4.2: Results of Study One - Questionnaire

<u>Section B</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The National Curriculum rightly promotes the curriculum objectives of both drama and English (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>)		13 17%	42 55.5%	21 27.5%
2. The shift in assessment weighting in GCSE drama from the practical to the written is a good thing.		6 8%	32 42%	38 50%
3. The National Curriculum has caused the distinction between drama and English to become blurred because the two subjects are regarded as one.	39 51.5%	37 48.5%		
4. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) promotes curriculum objectives, which are specifically related to drama.			47 62%	29 38%
5. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) ignores curriculum objectives, which are specifically related to drama.	44 58%	32 42%		
6. The objectives of English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) are general and could be applied to almost any National Curriculum subject.	19 25%	57 75%		
7. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) makes the assessment of drama easier for teachers because of the specific objectives.		3 4%	52 68.5%	21 27.5%
8. I agree with the equation of English oral skills with drama skills in <i>Speaking and Listening</i> .		2 3%	7 9%	67 88%

Figure 4.3: Results of Study One – Questionnaire

<u>Section C</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Drama can only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English.	30 39.5%	28 37%	18 23.5%	
2. Drama has separate core skills and knowledge from English.	66 87%	10 13%		
3. I am confused about what English and drama assessment objectives require.	6 8%	65 85.5%	5 6.5%	
4. I find the specific objectives of the National Curriculum helpful in planning my lessons.		1 1%	60 79%	15 20%
5. I find myself too limited by the objectives of the National Curriculum.	9 12%	66 87%	1 1%	
6. I prefer teaching drama now, after the introduction of the National Curriculum.			67 88%	9 12%
7. Having written work to mark helps my overall assessment of the student.	2 3%	7 9%	44 58%	23 30%
8. Assessing a student purely on practical work is not sufficient for a full consideration of their drama skills.		7 9%	35 46%	34 45%
9. Assessment in drama should be focused on the process of the students' work and not the product.		38 50%	38 50%	

Content of Drama

In the questionnaire, all respondents (87% strongly) thought that drama had separate core skills and knowledge from English. This has implications for drama's inclusion in the English National Curriculum. All respondents (75% strongly) regarded drama as an art form, indicating that drama should have a clear structure and content of its own, setting it apart from any other subject. There was also agreement of 96% (60.5% strongly) that a long-term aim of drama teaching was for students to understand the world in which they live, an echo of Heathcote (Johnson and O'Neill, 1984) giving drama a content as something social and 92% (62% strongly) thought that physical,

emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations was dramatic activity. This approach was advocated by Bolton (1979) who was firmly in the Heathcote camp. The DIE theorists are also followed by the 96% who agreed (83% strongly) that active involvement and identification with a fictitious situation was unique to drama. These results are very clear and show that some outline shape was being given to what the content of drama is or should be, according to the teachers surveyed.

However, there is obviously still some disagreement with regard to the subject of Theatre and technical Theatre skills. There were mixed results from the pilot (see previous chapter) with teachers not wanting theatre skills to be part of the GCSE syllabuses but wanting technical theatre skills included in assessment. Now in Study One, though 63% thought that drama was a separate subject from theatre, 43.5% wanted the GCSE syllabuses to include theatre skills. Yet, 58% thought that assessment (see below) should not include technical theatre skills. Although this ambivalence could be a part of the drama/Theatre divide argument, this may well have been a question of definition of terms and was therefore followed up in Study Two where more in-depth and follow up questions could be asked. The inclusion of theatre into the drama lesson brings the views of Hornbrook (1996) back into the debate

Drama is regarded by drama teachers as an art form and it is thought that a long-term aim of drama teaching is for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live. Teachers also think that physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations is dramatic activity. Beyond this, the questionnaire did not offer more information on the content of drama, apart from the view that it was *active* involvement and identification with fictitious situations that was the key to what sets drama apart from other subjects. Emphasis on the 'active' was again apparent, indicating that drama fell into the cognitive or sociocognitive schools of thought. Whether or not theatre skills are part of the content of drama still leaves teachers divided in opinion. Implications for the next stage of this research include the need to investigate further what is regarded as the content of drama and to clarify opinion about what theatre skills are and whether such skills should be regarded as part of the content of drama.

Teaching of Drama

It is clear that teachers were very much in agreement (100% with 89.5% strongly) with the DIE theorists, that a drama teacher should enable the student to create his or her own answers to problems. This has implications for both teaching and assessment as this follows the sociocognitive ideas that learning is experiential, that knowledge is not absolute and that education consists of joint problem solving.

Although 77.5 % agreed with the statement 'An important aim of drama teaching is for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama,' the remaining 22.5% disagreed, which presents the question; if this is not an aim then what should the aims be? Implications for the next stage must address the fact that the phrase 'the medium of drama' is open to various interpretations and there was therefore a necessity to explore this issue further in Study Two. Again the drama/Theatre argument was raised, as 63% of teachers thought that drama was a separate subject from Theatre. More investigation was required on the question of whether drama and theatre are branches of the same subject. This was addressed in Study Two at the interview stage, where more in-depth questions could be asked.

A high percentage of respondents, 72% (39.5% strongly) thought that drama could only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English which also has implications for drama being included in the English National Curriculum in Key Stage Three. Teachers (99%), also felt that the specific objectives of the National Curriculum were not helpful in planning lessons. No teachers preferred teaching now, after the introduction of the National Curriculum to teaching before it started.

Assessment of Drama

There was an interesting split with regard to what assessment in drama should test with 20% of teachers thinking that assessment should not test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills and 21% thinking that assessment should not test performance skills. The latter result could be part of the ongoing process/product argument, but the former raises the question if not drama skills then what should be assessed? It is very clear that 95% of teachers do not think that drama assessment should test English skills,

which is unfortunate for a subject that comes under the umbrella of English for Key Stage Three in National Curriculum terms. Another unclear result was that 42% of teachers thought that assessment in drama should include technical theatre skills and 58% of teachers thought that assessment should not. They were also confused (93.5%) about what the English and drama assessment objectives require. Having written work to mark helped only 12% of teachers with their overall assessment of the student. There was also apparent agreement (87%) that assessment in drama should be formative rather than summative and a clear statement was given that 91% of teachers thought that assessing a student on practical work was sufficient for a full consideration of drama skills.

The process/product debate was obviously still a contentious issue with an absolute 50-50 split between those who thought that assessment in drama should be focused on the process and those who thought assessment in drama should be focused on the product. Heathcote and other DIE theorists do not give any consideration to assessment.

There is agreement that assessment should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills and test performance skills. Clearly most teachers did not think that English skills should be assessed and, some did not think that theatre skills should be assessed. There was strong support for assessment in drama being primarily formative. Implications for the next stage are that the results seem to indicate some sort of confusion in attitude towards theatre skills as a greater number of teachers had previously *agreed* with the inclusion of theatre skills on GCSE syllabuses. More in-depth analysis seemed to be indicated here.

Models of Learning

In an attempt to discover the theoretical orientation of the teachers I tried to categorize each of the answers to the questions in Section A in the questionnaire, along the lines of the behavioural, cognitive and sociocognitive divisions of Models of Learning (Fig.2:1) This was obviously a rather imprecise exercise. From the questionnaire, it was not always clear-cut or even provable what was cognitive or sociocognitive, so I thought it was more acceptable to divide items that seemed to indicate a

behavioural approach i.e. specific skills or objectives to be memorized, mastered and assessed using a more hierarchical structure; from those, which appeared to signify a more cognitive approach. i.e. process-oriented, internal and/or social.

The exception to this loose division was question seven, where all teachers agreed that they should enable the students to create their own answers to problems, indicating an acknowledgement that knowledge is not absolute and signifying a sociocognitive approach. Agreement with question three's active involvement with fictitious situations could also indicate learning through shared social behaviour.

A cognitive approach may be indicated by the responses to the first two questions. To have as an aim for drama teaching that students should try to understand themselves and the world in which they live, is in line with the cognitive view that learning occurs when the student actively tries to understand the environment. Mental reasoning is also apparent in physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations. The complete agreement with question eight that drama is an art form could indicate a concern with the area of aesthetics and imagination, a more cognitive attitude.

A behavioural approach might be indicated by responses to question nine, where 80% thought that assessment in drama should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills.

It is not really clear what the indicated preference for formative assessment in drama shows in questions thirteen and fourteen. There is not sufficient evidence from the answers to these two questions to claim an emphasis on cognitive apprenticeship. However, as drama is taught through modelling and example or from a performance-based perspective, with emphasis on the process, a sociocognitive approach may be indicated. Interestingly, what then adds to the lack of clarity are the answers given in Section C, question nine, where teachers were equally divided about whether assessment should focus on the process or the product. This was one area where the interviews were needed for clarification.

In Section B of the questionnaire, only 17% of respondents thought that the National Curriculum rightly promoted the curriculum objectives of both drama and English, and the shift in assessment weighting in GCSE drama from the practical to the written was favoured by only 8% of teachers. This indicated that drama teachers were more in line generally with the sociocognitive view of assessment derived from the views of Vygotsky. (Lunt, 1993). All teachers thought that the National Curriculum had caused the distinction between drama and English to become blurred because the two subjects were regarded as one. None thought that English Attainment Target One promoted curriculum objectives that were specifically related to drama and all thought that it ignored curriculum objectives which were specifically related to drama. All teachers thought that the objectives of English Attainment Target One were general and could be applied to almost any National Curriculum subject. Only 4% thought that English Attainment Target One made the assessment of drama easier for teachers because of the specific objectives and only a very small number (3%) agreed with the equation of English oral skills with drama skills.

The participants all felt that the National Curriculum had blurred the distinction between the subjects of drama and English and that drama curriculum objectives were ignored. Many found the objectives of the National Curriculum both confusing and limiting. There was a marked division of opinion as to whether assessment should be focused on the process or the product. Implications for the next stage are that the objectives of the National Curriculum need further investigation and there is also a need for the process/product question to be investigated further.

This information identified areas where greater clarity was needed. In the interviews, respondents were asked to elaborate on the answers they had given. New questions arose from analysis of the above results, especially the last question in Section C, number nine, which generated amplified answers in the margin of the questionnaire such as “No room here to say what I really think” and “This needs proper discussion.”

Conclusions

Following this broader picture of existing conditions in East Anglia and because of the limitations of using a questionnaire, referred to previously, I now needed an in-depth understanding of the process of teaching and assessing drama. This was facilitated by interviews with selected respondents to my questionnaire, which are described in the next section.

As the results came in, I found that the answers started forming patterns of their own and did not fit so easily into my three chosen sections as I had at first thought. There were also the obvious general limitations of a questionnaire in that if respondents wanted to clarify or expand on their answers they were unable to do so. It also subsequently became clear in a number of the follow up interviews that some teachers had been interpreting terms differently. This was particularly true of the terms ‘technical skills’ and ‘theatre skills’ even though I had supplied a definition of technical skills next to the relevant question.

With reference to the four key research questions, teachers found some agreement about the content of drama, but their views were clouded by the contentious question of whether or not Theatre should be included. There was more general agreement concerning the teaching of drama. Teachers were concerned about the insistence on a written element at GCSE, though again opinion was divided on the process/product assessment argument. It was felt that drama should not be placed with English in the National Curriculum, as drama had separate skills and knowledge from English. From these results, there were certain indications that there may be a mismatch between teachers’ perspectives on content, delivery and assessment of drama and those implied by the National Curriculum.

In the next section, there follows an account of the interviews, which permitted deeper investigation of these and other questions and allowed time for different interpretations of terms to be discussed and clarified.

Study Two

Results

The interviews took place in each case at the end of the school day after the teacher had had a suitable break and on a one-to-one basis in the interviewee's office. Each interview took forty-five minutes and was audiotaped. I was aware of my possible influence on responses at the time, but I thought that this would be slightly alleviated by the fact that these people were all experienced Heads of Department and would therefore be fairly used to being interviewed, by head teachers and inspectors amongst others.

Instead of dividing one interview into three parts, as in the pilot, each of the three sets of questions (past experience, present experience and reflections on meaning) were treated as one interview of forty-five minutes each. There was usually a gap of one week between each interview, although this was not always possible and three sets of interviews took place with gaps of up to a month in between. In these interviews, a recap was necessary of what had taken place in the preceding interview(s). Analysis of data was primarily qualitative with occasional use of number to illustrate results.

The answers to the interview questions were classified according to the components of the three approaches to learning, behavioural, cognitive, and sociocognitive, as discussed in the Literature Review. I wanted to see if teachers fell into one of these three categories, or whether some teachers were a combination of two or three approaches. The responses of the teachers were also compared to the perspectives reflected in the English National Curriculum. When the comparisons were made, it was possible to see whether there was a match or a mismatch between teachers' perspectives and that of the National Curriculum.

Transcribing twelve sets of three interviews, 1620 minutes or 27 hours of audiotape was very time consuming and slow. It took more time as I followed Seidman (1991)

“In addition, the transcriber should record all the nonverbal signals such as coughs, laughs, sighs, pauses, outside

noises, telephone rings, and interruptions that occur on the tape. A detailed and careful transcript that recreates the verbal and nonverbal material of the interview can greatly enhance the task of the researcher who may be studying the transcript months after the interview occurred.” (Seidman, 1991, p. 88)

Although the researcher must necessarily try to eliminate bias in her own response, the first step in dealing with such a vast amount of text is to reduce it to what is of importance. I used my research questions as a starting point for my search, but also allowed unanticipated research categories to arise from the data. I did this by going through and marking what I considered to be of relevant. All I could do at this stage was rely on my own judgement in considering what was pertinent to the research questions and my own integrity in trying to come to the text with an open mind. To facilitate member-checking I asked two of the interviewees to read my markings on their transcripts to see whether they agreed with them. Both of them considered these markings to be satisfactory.

In marking the transcripts, I looked for similarities in response as to the content, teaching and assessment of drama or for key words appearing, such as ‘process’ or ‘facilitator’, taking note of how many occurrences there were of each. The responses were then grouped into categories and further examined for any recurring themes. One limitation I found in this process was that the first transcript studied could dictate the categories. I found, as I progressed, that categories changed and were adapted as I worked through information from the other respondents. Another limitation was that an important point could get lost because only one person made it. It was essential to consider such points carefully and not just ignore them. The main aim, to hear what the teachers were saying, was always kept in mind explicitly. The goal was to put this material into a form in which it could be shared or displayed. (Miles and Huberman, 1994)

Careful study of the data, keeping the research questions and the approaches to learning referred to in the literature review in mind, identified significant

phenomena. After deciding which phenomena shared sufficient similarities, various categories were identified and labelled. (Gall et al., 1996)

1. With regard to the teaching of drama the themes which emerged were:

- Content
- Creating Meaning
- Life Skills
- Drama as a Teaching Tool
- Subject Status
- Assessment
- Process/Product
- Measuring ability
- Drama/Theatre

2. With regard to models of learning, the categories were: the learner; how learning occurs; what learning is; what knowledge consists of; how new learning occurs and what education consists of. This in turn, invited discussion of written work, subject boundaries and the National Curriculum. Interview questions can be found in Appendix Ten. Discussion of the above points follows a brief examination of some aspects of teachers' beliefs.

Teachers' Beliefs

Only two of the twelve people interviewed had begun their careers as drama teachers, so their responses to the questions concerning their views on drama teaching when they started teaching had to be confined to the subject they taught at the time, namely English in 10 out of 12 cases. There were many anecdotes of events both humorous and disastrous from student and newly qualified teacher stages, which did not necessarily yield codifiable information but I continued to try to listen actively without interruption. I often found that by doing this I could reflect a question later in the interview back to the anecdote. e.g. 'When you were telling me about that lesson where you...' However there did appear to a great deal of commonality at this stage. When people began teaching ideas in general were not thought out clearly, particularly with regard to subject content and teaching styles.

All of those interviewed (twelve) felt that before they went into teaching they had preconceived ideas about the job from how they had been taught at school, generally a behaviourist model. They then become idealistic as students, had learned from the experience and now had a more realistic approach to the job, endorsing Lacey (1977) who found that many teachers followed this behaviourist-sociocognitive-behaviourist pattern of belief development. A love of subject prompted most of these teachers to teach drama. The answers to the question '*Why did you choose to teach drama?*' were all short and to the point, with nine saying they chose to teach drama because they 'loved' the subject and the remaining three saying that they began as English teachers and gradually took on more drama classes as they enjoyed it so much. Typical was Fiona, who said 'I love drama, theatre, doing school plays, and am-dram. All of it, I love it!'

Of the eight discrete drama departments, half (a third of all those interviewed) had no specific drama INSET. In fact the comment of the drama departments was usually 'none specifically' except for those who admitted that time was given to them for standardization tasks and administration for GCSE. The other half concentrated their INSET on these administration tasks for the GCSE which left no time for INSET for Key Stage Three. The departments who were part of faculties (4) were better served with training given in conjunction with both or all subjects in the faculty on a regular basis with the Head of Department/Faculty aiming for a unified approach to paperwork across subjects, usually for the purposes of a Department/Faculty handbook. Those who were Heads of Faculty with wider responsibilities echoed Liz who said:

'we have what I arrange, as Head of English and Expressive Arts. I try to keep some harmony in approach to schemes of work and policy documents across all the subjects in my faculty, so we're all writing homework policies and assessment policies and trying to integrate schemes of work across the faculty.'

As Cornett (1990) writes of how teachers were capable of different actions indicating contradictory beliefs according to context, so this illustrates the

point that there was a marked difference in attitude between those who ran faculties and those who were just Heads of drama departments.

With regard to the question concerning the most satisfying part of the job, every teacher interviewed included 'seeing students succeed' or 'seeing students make progress' and eight included the term 'seeing non-academic students succeed' (or make progress). Other satisfying parts were: 'doing school productions' (seven); 'seeing students develop self confidence' (five); and 'watching students learn or demonstrate tolerance of others' views' (five). From these results, it can be seen that student progress and student success are very high on these teachers' agenda.

Content

Early in their teaching careers, few had thought the idea of content through. One who had was Beth:

'Yes I thought about all this at college. we were definitely taught that drama was not theatre and we shouldn't confuse the two, but they never actually said what drama *was* only what it *wasn't* and I went away thinking that I was a socio-constructivist*, but as soon as I did teaching practice I had the idealism knocked out of me, well not completely out of me, perhaps sideways, with deadlines for GCSE and reports and everything'

*This was the respondent's own use of the term. She was the only teacher to use any specialist vocabulary.

There was strong evidence amongst the responses from teachers that the prevailing orthodoxy of the time (remembering that these experienced teachers would all have been training in the 1970s) was the Heathcote view that Drama and Theatre were separate subjects, yet all of the teachers taught theatre.

Teachers appeared to find the question of whether drama has its own subject content the most difficult to answer and differed amongst themselves quite

considerably in their answers. There did seem to be some sort of a core in that all respondents included mention of the human condition in some way including: 'people and their lives' 'how people deal with their lives,' 'learning skills to cope with life,' 'working out solutions to life's problems' all echoing the views of Heathcote. Paul's contribution was quite agitated:

'I've never really understood this question and I always turn it back on teachers who ask this.....What is the content of History...? It's about what people did in the past. What is the content of Geography? ...It's about where people live. What is the content of Literature? It's about what people have written. What is the content of Maths? It's about how people have constructed a system to calculate with... The central part is always *people*. I think that drama is about how people deal with their lives'

There were also many statements (ten) to the effect that drama was an 'art form.' This is something upon which Heathcote, Bolton, Neelands, Hornbrook and Abbs are united. Further prompting as to what might be meant by this term encouraged 6 responses along the lines of 'I'd have to think about that one,' 'Well its difficult to define' and 'I'd need more notice of a question like that.' The three who attempted a definition talked about art as 'playing with reality' or 'to do with creativity,' However, Beth claimed

'Drama is an art form in both its manifestations. I refuse to see drama and Theatre as totally separate; they are aspects of the same experience. The core is the human condition. If you work on an aspect in the form of a theme or a problem in drama lessons and you've discovered something unusual or exciting or thought provoking and the result is good enough, then you can perform to an audience and tell everyone about it. I think that's what playwrights are doing all the time'

Following this theme was Liz:

‘In a way its an active form of debate. You don’t academically discuss solutions you try them out and see if they work. But it’s more than that, it’s an art form and this is where theatre comes in. It’s creative, you want to create something beautiful and worthwhile and show it to an audience’

All teachers regarded drama as an art form but when attempting to articulate what they meant by ‘art form’ they broadly tended to claim drama as an art form, in line with Hornbrook (1989). Although they did not go so far as to say that the art form is theatre, as he does, they repeated his idea of a product, which is valuable in itself and not just because it has brought about a change in the student. They also spoke in terms of a skills base of drama ‘conventions.’ However, they still did not say exactly what this art form was. Shulman (1986a) argues for more research in what he regards as this neglected area of subject matter. While teachers cannot find agreement in the area of content, which is admittedly clouded by whether theatre is part of the subject, assessment is an even bigger issue. There was a contention that being good at drama involved having a certain quality that could be recognised by people in the field, but could not necessarily be articulated or written down for assessment purposes. Where there was agreement appeared in the mention of both ‘communication’ and ‘meaning’ by nearly all the participants. The heart of this particular debate appears to be to whom is this communication directed? Is the creation of meaning in drama for oneself or for other people?

Creating Meaning

The communication theme was explained by Henrietta:

‘It’s about communication. Within drama, you are communicating with the other pupils in your group and they are communicating and working things – meanings - out together. Within Theatre you are attempting to communicate to an audience’

Heathcote does contend that drama is about how meanings are revealed but these meanings are for oneself, not for an audience. Bolton says that this creation of meaning is in order to 'explore being', but again this is for oneself not for others. The idea for both is that the revelation of meanings is part of a pursuit of knowledge that is not absolute. Teachers point to the drama 'conventions' as the tools to create meaning and some include theatre skills in this process. Hornbrook requires an intellectual underpinning of the drama and an engagement with the cultural and historical circumstances and it should be remembered that most of these teachers' original subject was English. As Wilson and Wineberg (1988) claimed, subject background can affect what is taught. Beth underlined this point:

Anyone with the slightest knowledge of literature or...or...plays, knows that they are written within a context...If they weren't they'd have no truth in them. 'Drama must involve sharing what is discovered...theatre... That's part of acquiring knowledge... sharing ideas. You can't ignore everything that's been discovered in the past and start in a vacuum. What's the point?'

Most of the teachers (ten) agreed that meanings should be shared and all thought that what was important in drama was the internal creative process. As well as the creation of meaning in the pursuit of knowledge, there were those teachers who also regarded drama as the learning of appropriate actions.

Life Skills

The idea of drama as a life or social skills course introduces a moral element to the subject. There were many individual quotations about drama which included the assertion that drama gave students 'self-confidence' or helped with a student's 'self-expression.' These are attributes of drama which have retained their association with drama, along with 'life skills,' since the days of Slade (1954) and Way (1967). We hear from Alison, in particular, at one end of the scale:

‘Yes it’s a sort of socialization course. You present them with various situations and problems and let them work out solutions in conjunction with you as the teacher’

whose admittedly sociocognitive views do not address the problem of content, to Barry at the other:

‘It’s really dangerous to see drama as socializing the pupils, also... (seeing drama as) servicing the rest of the curriculum. It then loses status and the fight begins again for recognition as an important subject’

However, there is another danger or concern, apart from the perceived loss of status, which is the question of whose code of ethics is being taught? Bolton lays stress on personal growth and social development but such ‘appropriate behaviour’ can only be the teacher’s interpretation of the socially accepted norms of the time. Alison claimed

‘It (drama) teaches them self-confidence, as well as the old syllabus’ criteria of - ability to negotiate, listen to others, interact, be assertive and what-have-you’

Again, who decides what is laudable? How far does assertiveness go before it is regarded as aggression, or self-confidence before it is regarded as arrogance? This approach could also mean that emphasis is laid according to the personality of the teacher rather than in relation to the subject matter (Bullough et al., 1991). Teachers tend to talk about life skills, social skills and personal development interchangeably, but this may not be the case. If teachers are improving students’ life chances in the vocational sense of making them more employable, this may not be compatible with making them better people. Beth made the point quite succinctly:

‘They (personal attributes such as self confidence etc.) may be by-products of drama, but not drama’s *raison d’etre*. You are not teaching self-confidence, you are teaching drama’

A further problem also rises in the shape of assessment. What would the criteria be for a personally or socially developed person? and who would be qualified to assess this? As well as these claims for personal and social development, another oft-used phrase was that drama was a 'teaching tool.'

Drama as a Teaching Tool

Heathcote spoke of being a teacher first and a teacher of drama second and this was echoed by Neelands' (1984) contention that drama is a classroom resource and not a discrete subject. Work by drama teachers in other curriculum areas, particularly Fines (1974) in history teaching, reveals similar beliefs. Following this viewpoint, Fiona, spoke of drama as

'Giving kids skills which can be used in other lessons.

Drama is an education tool isn't it? You can use drama skills to learn anything'

Whilst it is true that drama techniques can be used to teach other subjects, following this line of thought to its conclusion could mean that drama exists merely to service the rest of the curriculum. Such a view would also have a bearing on the status of drama. There would be no necessity for a discrete timetabled subject and the concern with content would not arise. This view would also be opposed by Hornbrook (1991) who sees drama as a separate and unique art form.

Subject Status

Appertaining to the least satisfying aspects of the job, a high number of teachers (eleven), mentioned stress, but then in discussion said they thought that stress was not peculiar to drama teaching, but was common to teaching generally. This was also true for the large number of teachers (ten) who mentioned poor student behaviour and for the teachers (ten) who mentioned paperwork in general. With specific reference to drama, the parts of the work which were the least satisfying seemed to fall into two distinct categories according to management position in the respective schools. The four Heads of Faculty, Barry, Paul, Liz and Henrietta, all talked about the GCSE syllabus changes, and the fact that the written element made it harder

for the non-academic students to succeed. A typical comment was made by Paul:

‘It’s disheartening seeing non-academic pupils, who don’t achieve anywhere else on the curriculum and who would once have achieved in drama ‘failing’ (gesture indicating quotation marks) under new syllabuses’

Of those who ran discrete drama departments all had at the top of their lists, other people’s attitudes to drama in some form. i.e. either a) Senior Management and having to justify drama’s place on the curriculum and obtain adequate money for their departments; or b) staff room colleagues and continually defending drama against jibes that it was not an important or ‘real’ subject. Deborah remarked

‘you do get rather tired of people saying things like “Going to teach them all to ‘be a tree’ then?” you try and laugh, but it does show that people have no idea what drama is really all about.’

There were several remarks to the effect that drama departments were only tolerated because they did the school play and thereby brought kudos to the school. There was also a general resentment about drama’s perceived lowly status but Neelands (1984) contention that drama is not a discrete subject would not have helped this position. Teachers (nine) talked about the written paper at GCSE and how it penalised the high quality drama student who did not have very good writing skills and there was further resentment about the more ‘academic’ students being advised not to opt for drama at GCSE or especially Theatre studies at ‘A’ level. This raises the question of what is meant by ‘academic’ and similarly which subjects are perceived as academic. These questions are also linked to assessment.

Assessment

Some teachers appeared to be fairly anti-assessment in the earlier years of schooling, with seven saying either they did not think it mattered or they

didn't think that it was appropriate, especially in the lower school. As Phil said

'I always thought that it (drama) was about confidence and self-esteem and understanding and tolerance of others. How can you grade that?'

Other than this, teachers were in favour of formative assessment with effort and attainment grades used for reports or Records of Achievement. Fiona made a typical remark:

'We have to do effort and attainment grades for the ROA's.
I find effort easy enough, but what's attainment in drama?'

Without addressing this point, many (nine), responded along the lines that two grades were used at Key Stage Three for any written reports, namely effort and attainment, a point made by Beth:

'At Key Stage Three, I am happy to go along with the effort and attainment marks. They are usually pretty close together at this stage anyway. The harder they work the better they will do.'

and a supplementary point made by Kevin:

'In this climate you have to come up with something for Records of achievement, form filling or whatever, but it's the comments that are valuable there not the scores. I mean both student and teacher comments.'

This line was developed by Liz:

'There's what they have to learn because they need to know it for the exams and there's this... I don't know.... accountability. You have to have pieces of paper don't you? You have to have boxes ticked and effort and

attainment grades and National Curriculum levels and exam results and reports and Records of Achievement. You get to the stage where you're inventing tasks, so that you can have a grade to write down somewhere, so really, if you get to the stage when you are doing that assessment is driving the curriculum... I don't know though.... drama teachers fought for parity with other subjects so they've got to accept an assessment system, if they want to be taken seriously.'

Assessment in this lower school context is always seen as formative but teachers also talked about assessment as being 'subjective' and, as some put it, 'indefinable.' Barry raised the point about subjectivity, and was one of those who had wanted assessment in the lower school.

'I always thought that you needed assessment at KS3, although it wasn't called that, Key Stage Three then was it? Otherwise, drama wouldn't have the status of other subjects, which was dangerous for its place on the curriculum. It (assessment) was subjective but why not? We are trained professionals and our judgement should be respected. I loved assessment in the old Leicester Mode Three for GCSE, which assessed the whole pupil... didn't you? (laughs) you know, the ability to move towards a structured solution, and ability to use the interactive process appropriately, and what was it?... oh yeah, the ability to evaluate. Great stuff!'

Continuing in this vein, nine of the teachers had fond memories of the old GCSE syllabuses. Pat remarked:

'GCSE assessment was phenomenal....continuous assessment, which meant writing up every pupil for nearly every lesson and a four day practical examination at the end, but it was much fairer than today.'

Several teachers, six (three quarters of those who had actually used this particular syllabus) used the words 'fair' or fairness' about the old system. This was for three reasons. The first was that every stage of the drama process was assessed from the very beginning, including students' contributions at the planning and negotiation stages, so that attributes such as hard work and commitment were rewarded. Secondly, that the assessment was diagnostic to enable further learning. Thirdly the teachers' judgement was accepted for assessment purposes. These points are illustrated by Beth:

'What gets me nowadays is when you get this talented but lazy student who puts no effort into the process and then comes in at the end, which is all the examiner sees, and waltzes off with an 'A' because they are a talented actor... Then you get someone who's slogged their guts out and been a real team player who gets nothing.'

Following Smith and Neale's (1989) assertion that beliefs are discovery oriented, everyone said that they had changed their views on how to assess over their years in teaching. It was interesting that different answers on assessment were given according to Key Stages. Teachers who were strong advocates of formative assessment at Key Stage Three were more, though not totally, tolerant of summative assessment for GCSE. However, they struggled to find words to describe the 'something extra' that was being assessed, which went beyond skills.

Assessment at Key Stage Three seemed to be almost entirely concerned with having something to write for record keeping and reporting purposes. With reference to Key Stage Four, the majority (eleven) mentioned the GCSE syllabus and the fact that there are guidelines on assessment from the examination boards. All asserted that they did not agree with the examination boards on assessment with regard to the written paper. All of those who could remember, that is half of those interviewed, and had taught the 100% practical coursework GCSE in the 1980s, had positive recollections. Although they thought that the paperwork from the continuous assessment of each individual student was hard on the teacher,

they all agreed that the system was fairer because the student's role in the whole drama process was constantly monitored and assessed by the teacher who was always present. Comments on today's syllabuses were more critical but reasonably accepting, as Beth said

'At Key stage four it's a bit different. They are working towards a nationally recognised qualification. You can only go by what is set down in the syllabus, whether you agree with it or not. The student must fulfil all the components of the syllabus at a certain standard.'

Teachers felt that what should be assessed was the students' knowledge and appropriate use of the drama 'conventions but also believed that was not the 'whole story.' The GCSE syllabuses, therefore, stopped short of the whole story because they did not allow for the cognitive approach including intuitive or subjective teacher assessment. (Appendix Eleven, provides a representative GCSE syllabus)

It is important to bear in mind that the earlier syllabus referred to by these teachers was entirely educational drama with little or no theatre input. Considering the climate of educational drama from which these teachers came, it is remarkable to note that the elements of theatre introduced to the syllabuses have been accepted and taught accordingly with no real objections raised. Far more contentious was the introduction of the written paper, which was universally felt to penalise students who were good at drama but less able in English. Thus, Hornbrook's emphasis on theatre, text and technical skills already lives within the curriculum, at least at GCSE, where summative assessment is used. Although this could be cited as an example of discrepancies between beliefs and classroom practice (Galton et al., 1980) it is also a result of the National Curriculum requirements. These assessment issues are inextricably linked with the process/product debate.

Process/Product

These questions certainly prompted the longest answers. However, answers were very anecdotal, to illustrate points being made, and quite repetitive. Strong feelings were expressed with five teachers claiming that the whole

point and focus of the drama lesson should be about the process, four arguing for the focus to be on the product and three arguing for a balance. The four Heads of Faculty were all in favour of the focus being on the product. However, this was with regard to drama itself. All thought that theatre and technical skills should be focused on the final product.

However nostalgically half of the interviewees looked back at the days of 100% practical coursework, with its emphasis on the process, on closer inspection they did not appear to wish to return to this kind of assessment. Opinions appeared to have changed, lending weight to the theory that beliefs are discovery oriented (Smith and Neale, 1989). There were many comments along the lines of ‘You’ve got to have a balance of process and product,’ ‘you can’t pretend that the end result is of no significance’ but there were differences of opinion from Phil at one end of the spectrum, who was in tune with the DIE theorists:

‘What you learn in drama should be internalised so that you see the absorbed skills, if you like, being put into practice at GCSE and you have to judge the students on that. The skills they use to work out solutions. I think that the whole of the drama lesson...course...whatever, is a process, which is why I find examination of an end product difficult to cope with, because that process involves the internalisation of all that has gone before and all the shared processes of the lessons, with the other students and me as the teacher, which helps the individual student extend their knowledge’;

to Liz at the other, who inclined to the theories of Hornbrook (1989):

‘There’s no point in having a process unless there’s a result. Of course you must assess the product, that’s where it’s all leading. What’s the point of having a wonderful process that leads nowhere? What kind of process is that?’

The remaining ten were for a balance, like Deborah:

‘As far as I’m concerned there are recognised drama skills and you assess them like you would in any other subject, I don’t really see a problem... I do think it should be continuous though, you can’t judge on a one off performance at the end of weeks work and know who contributed what. You need a balance. You must assess the process and the product.’

This idea of balance indicates a move away from the Heathcote school of thought, which does mention assessment, towards the Hornbrook (1989) view that there is such a thing as successful drama and who insists that drama is a craft which means that in the end there is a product to assess.

Within drama, Liz argued for the importance of the product. For as Griffin (1996) declares it is easier to assess skills than a process and it is also a requirement of the examination boards that such assessment takes place.

‘I keep coming back to this idea...no...fact, it’s a fact isn’t it? There’s a nationally recognised qualification at the end of all this...GCSE...You’ve got to let future employers or colleges know that these students have reached a certain standard and you must have proof, you must be able to point to a product...I think I said last week didn’t I? You can’t just have a process, you’ve got to be leading somewhere.’

and Phil argued for the process:

‘It’s not just the one lesson or the one unit of work; it’s the whole course. The whole drama thing is a process. Its about developing self-esteem and self-confidence and tolerance of other people. It should make you a better person; all that comes about in the process. It doesn’t matter what the finished product is, or how good it is, it’s that they’ve gone through the process.’

One significant phrase here is “make you a better person.” A teacher cannot assess a student on whether they have become a better person. However, the main point being made is that assessment should be entirely focused on the process.

Beth argued for a balance, and she was in the majority (ten):

‘This debate has been going on for years now, since all the ructions of 1987. I think it’s about time we got over all that. The process *is* important, it’s where all the planning and organisational skills come in, where the students have to be adaptable to other student’s views and learn to negotiate, but the product is supposed to be where they are headed for. You have to have the product not only for the satisfaction of an end result but for them to evaluate what they’ve done and learn from the experience...what worked and what didn’t and why etcetera.’

Many teachers (ten) emphasised that recognition and appreciation of the creative elements were facilitated by the teacher observing the work in process. All teachers said that they thought that assessment in drama was sometimes subjective but that this should be accepted and recognised as proper use of their professional judgement. The use of subjective judgement is necessary not only for both process and the product, but also because drama is multi-faceted. If, as Gardner (1983) suggests, drama is a multi-intelligence activity and does not have a single capacity for conventional assessment, then teachers (and examiners) need to know what they are measuring.

Measuring Ability

The next category of ‘talent’ had not been mentioned before but appeared to be causing some problems with regard to assessment. In the lower school, there was the odd comment like Pat’s:

‘You have to comment on them taking part in the lessons I suppose, but they can’t help it if they are not naturally good at drama, others aren’t but try their hearts out. Who do you give the best grade to?’

Also with so much of GCSE drama being built around group work, as Pat said

‘an individual can be limited by the group they are in. I had a really talented candidate last year who was in with a group of candidates who weren’t very good and (she) ended up with a lower mark than she should have done.’

This is a limitation of Heathcote’s contention that drama is a group activity. This difficulty was also mentioned by Henrietta:

‘With drama, I find it easy enough to give effort and attainment grades at key stage three because I am happy to rely on my own subjective judgement as a professional and I think that other people ought to trust me on that too. At GCSE you obviously follow the syllabus, but I have a problem with talent. It must be like teaching music, when a pupil can do all the theory and write about composers or whatever they do in music lessons I don’t know (laughs) but they must just have pupils who can play instruments to grade eight or are in orchestras or something and are just musically talented. It’s the same in drama. It confuses what you are assessing.’

Liz had a pragmatic answer to that one:

‘Yes there is talent, that’s a difficult one, but then that’s universal isn’t it? I mean students are talented in other subjects and its just accepted and they get higher grades; you can’t grade students purely on effort all the time. At GCSE there’s a qualification at the end of it, and that’s got to have some credibility.’

There is no consideration of ability within the writings of the DIE theorists. Heathcote categorically states that within drama there is never any acting involved. From these standpoints, assessment is even more of a grey area. Hornbrook is clearly more in tune with current practice with his concept of 'successful drama' and his ideas of 'craft.' However, whilst Hornbrook's 'intellectual underpinning' eases the problem of assessment in some ways, by giving the teacher something more concrete to assess for examination purposes, neither drama nor theatre were felt to be located entirely in the cognitive domain. Drama, especially, was also felt to be located in the affective domain where Heathcote and Bolton, in particular firmly situate their drama. This, as Liz believes, brings its own problems:

'You have to be careful with emotions, these are adolescents'

As with this warning, difficulties are highlighted but with no solution offered. In their answers, teachers tended to be pointing out all the problems associated with assessment, but a component of the 'problem,' as we repeatedly see, is that teachers are not clear about what they are meant to be assessing. In their own eyes, they instinctively know what is good drama because they are in the field. What they cannot do is transfer this subjective judgement into GCSE or National Curriculum terms. Attempts to make creativity measurable and find an appropriate methodology acceptable to examination boards (Beattie, 2000) are regarded as unwieldy in a crowded curriculum. Another factor in this lack of clarity is the process/product debate, which is in turn closely linked to the disagreement about the inclusion of theatre in the subject of drama.

Drama/Theatre

The answers to the questions on theatre cleared up much confusion about various terms and how they were being used and provided some explanation of why conflicting views have been expressed in the questionnaire. There was general understanding of what was meant by 'drama' but there were misunderstandings about the use of the terms 'Theatre,' 'Theatre skills' and 'Technical skills' with some teachers using the last two terms (and some

using all the terms) interchangeably. In the interviews, it was easier to define terms and interviewees were able to respond accordingly (Appendix Four). When this was clarified, the responses became clearer.

The number of teachers who thought that drama and Theatre were separate subjects was five. Interestingly, all of these were the teachers who considered that the most important aspect of drama teaching was in the process. The seven who, like Beth, thought that drama and theatre were 'aspects of the same experience' were those who argued either for the product or for a balanced approach. There was general agreement (eleven) that theatre skills were introduced gradually as the students progressed in drama, usually around Year Nine. Again, all teachers taught theatre skills at GCSE. While this can be attributed to the requirements of the examination syllabuses, teachers did not raise any objection to teaching theatre, indicating that during the constant interaction between beliefs and practice, change can come about by alterations in either (Richardson, 1995). There was more disagreement with regard to Technical skills. No technical skills were taught in Key Stage Three but ten included technical skills as part of the course at GCSE. Although this option was offered, a small number did not really agree with its inclusion in the syllabus with three teachers suggesting that they would rather it was left to Key Stage Five, the 'A' level stage. Henrietta remarked

'I would really like to see this drama/Theatre thing sorted out. In English we have English language and English Literature and aspects of both coincide in the lessons but they are two separate qualifications at GCSE and everyone accepts that. Well why can't we do the same for drama and Theatre? Have one course, including both branches of the subject and accepting the overlap, like we do in English, resulting in two qualifications at the end, GCSE drama and GCSE Theatre?'

Although some teachers (five) thought that drama and Theatre were separate subjects, in accordance with the DIE theorists, there was a general feeling that both should be taught. GCSE level saw a general acceptance of, if not

agreement with, Hornbrook's desire for structure, technical and theatre skills, an example of teacher theory being reformulated by practice (Anning, 1988). There was even talk of links with other arts but never with English, as Abbs (1991) would have wished for his aesthetic curriculum. Nevertheless, however many differences there were on this question, teachers were unanimous in their opposition to written work. With patterns beginning to emerge about teachers' perspectives on the content, teaching and assessment of drama, the next set of questions, made with reference to the models of learning adopted, helped define teachers' attitudes to teaching and learning.

Teaching and Learning

When discussing their early experiences, teachers talked about having only 'vague ideas' about content and teaching and of there being a 'body of information' which they 'imparted'. This is in accordance with Calderhead (1988), who wrote of how teachers' beliefs were not always thought out and how teachers usually have restricted or simple accounts of the processes involved in teaching and learning. Pat said 'I was very behavioural, we didn't know anything else in those days.' and Liz summed up the general view:

'There was no reflection; I carried on as I'd been taught at school. I didn't think about it that much. There was a lot assumed. You gave students information and they learnt it if they listened.'

Concerning their present experience, there was division in this area between the teaching of drama and the teaching of Theatre. The words 'facilitator' or 'facilitate' were used by eight of the interviewees with regard to the teaching of drama. The words 'guiding' or 'guide' were mentioned by eight, 'planting ideas' or 'making suggestions' by six, 'stepping in' or 'helping with selection of ideas' by five, a 'social context' mentioned by five and Alison mentioned 'socializing' the students. These ideas of 'selection' and of drama being grounded in the social (although not socialization) are reiterations of the Heathcote school of thought. While these comments were all made with reference to drama there was generally

a different teaching style advocated for Theatre where words like ‘instruct,’ ‘tell,’ ‘show them,’ ‘talk’ and ‘impart knowledge’ were used by nine. As Henrietta said

‘I think that you are many things, sometimes you are a facilitator for a drama lesson, sometimes you are a director for a performance, sometimes you stand at the front and ‘chalk and talk’...or rather ‘whiteboard marker and talk’...sometimes you are consultant. I don’t think that there’s just one role, it depends on what you are teaching’

Beth echoed this comment:

‘Its ‘horses for courses.’ I use all sorts of different methods, whole class teaching, group work, individual work, students leading a session; how I teach depends on the material I want to deliver, teaching a drama lesson exploring a theme is very different to teaching say stage make up.’

Liz made a general point:

‘All lessons need a structure; you should go in with aims and objectives for each lesson. Students need a framework and the teacher needs to know where they are going and where they want the students to go. You are there to provide this scaffolding and to guide and instruct as necessary. If you just expect students to regulate themselves you are asking for disaster, you need to have control... I sound a bit prescriptive don’t I? But I don’t mean that students don’t have freedom within the framework to explore, I just mean that it shouldn’t be some sort of free form, aimless mess.... you *are* there to teach them after all.’

Phil also mentioned this controlling role of the teacher:

‘You’re there as a facilitator and also to impart knowledge. Students are usually happy when they are ‘doing’, but they wouldn’t have the self-discipline to say evaluate or reflect on what they had done unless you as the teacher made them do it.’

There are indications here that the role of the teacher is dependent on the content of what is being taught.

The Learner

Teachers admitted that their views of the learner had been very ‘hazy’ in their early years of teaching and that these views had changed considerably over the years. Many (ten) were definite that their views had changed, but two said they had not changed their views, like Beth:

‘No, my views haven’t changed. I see students as participators in their own learning. I always have and I always will.’

One teacher said that they couldn’t say whether they had changed or not as they didn’t really have a view in the first place. Of the nine, several qualified their remarks along the lines of Fiona:

‘Yes... well to be fair I don’t know that I had any formed views of the learner in the first place, but I’ve developed some now. I used to think that kids were just empty vessels and you filled them up with your knowledge, they were the receptors if you like. Now they take more of a part in it all.’

or Barry:

‘It’s this stereotype of teachers isn’t it? Which you carry with you from your own schooldays and is perpetuated in media portrayals. You are the expert and you tell pupils

how to do it. Then you realise pretty quickly that that's not how it's going to be, particularly in drama. Pupils have to participate in their own learning, or they're not really learning are they? They're memorizing... or not as the case may be'

The phrase 'the learner as active' was used by four teachers along with 'they explore and find meanings for themselves,' 'pupils take a more active role in lessons,' 'take an active part,' 'let them find their own solutions,' 'they're not passive recipients of information.' This took the total of phrases concerned with action to nine. A typical response was given by Liz:

'Yes, but then I've reflected a great deal on my own practice over the years and read more about educational issues and I suppose I've changed my mind about the learner. I now think that if the learner doesn't take an active part, then they are not going to internalise anything from the lesson... and I don't just mean in drama.'

This view of the learner as active can be found within the debates of all the major theorists and in both the cognitive and sociocognitive models. The more sociocognitive response is revealed in the emphasis on shared social behaviour and the experiential view of learning, which is linked to how learning occurs.

How Learning Occurs

It was interesting to note that teachers made a definite division between how learning occurs within the teaching of theatre and within the teaching of drama. A high proportion of respondents (ten) mentioned that they no longer thought that learning was to do with memorizing facts. Samples of comments made were: 'It's no good if it doesn't come from the heart is it?' 'It's social.' 'They learn from one another.' Henrietta made an interesting point:

I think that learning is very much linked to the sharing of culture. Pupils who do not succeed in the conventional

sense at school can master complicated rules of sports, like cricket or computer language or how to set a video, because they are interested and they've learnt these things in conjunction with their friends.'

This echoes the sociocognitive view of learning beginning with shared social behaviour. However, a note of caution was sounded by Phil

'Students left on their own do not always work together. It's idealistic to think that you can let them find all the answers themselves; they need you to guide them. You let them go as far as they can and then step in when they're beginning to be unsure, but you don't have all the answers, because there are no absolutes.

Others underlined this idea of there being no absolutes and thus reiterated the sociocognitive view of learning as experiential: 'Much of the time there are no right answers.' 'The answer is what is true for them at the time.' 'They learn what works for them' 'There are no absolutes.' This point about internalisation was made several times (eight) as by Phil:

'I think that learning occurs when the student internalises what is happening and is involved in the process.'

However, Liz made a plea for a realistic approach:

'Learning is the same in all subjects. I don't agree with teachers who want to make drama a special case. I think that you get on with what is... We'd all like a perfect world where all students went at their own pace and you let them explore with their peers and then judged the moment with each student when they needed you to help. Yes I suppose I do think that that is how learning occurs. But the reality is that we have classes of thirty-three or whatever and we have to cover the schemes of work or the syllabus... You know what I mean, we as teachers know what the exam boards want, and if you drill students for exams you get

them through it and then they are pleased, their parents are pleased, you get congratulated as a teacher and the school benefits in terms of league tables and suchlike. You know you've got to live with reality.....You might not like it but you do.'

Beth made a similar point:

'Yes well I'm a firm believer in the zone of proximal development. Do you remember when we all went on that Heathcote course and she actually mentioned Vygotsky? I was really surprised, although I don't know why. But I have to say that she is a very charismatic teacher and students just don't lie down and roll over like that for everyone.... Of course you can work like that at Key Stage Three, but GCSE just doesn't lend itself to the kind of approach. You can't wait for individual students to get there, there's a syllabus to get through. Then there's stuff to teach them for the written paper. Sometimes the cognitive apprenticeship has to be hurried along somewhat. (Laughs) Which is not to say I don't believe in it, just that you can't do it properly in the current educational climate.'

Within drama, there were many similar comments about the role of the teacher, along the lines of 'You take them with you,' 'Intervene to guide as appropriate,' 'I have solutions, they can learn from me,' 'I will take them with me,' 'I step in when they are beginning to be unsure.' This was in direct contrast to the responses to the teaching of Theatre where the comments were more like: 'You have to tell them what they need to know.' Typically from Deborah:

'I think that you guide their work, but you let them have a go first, at least in drama. Theatre is more of a taught thing. If you are teaching someone lighting skills there are right and wrong answers, and of course there's the safety factor, you can't let them blow themselves up!' or Kevin: 'I think

students learn in different ways now according to the subject matter. In pure drama you can let them have their heads and step in when it needs direction, I mean... I don't mean theatrical direction, like a director, I mean teaching wise, but with theatre skills, its like other more conventional subjects, you have to tell them what they need to know.'

So learning is experiential, but only as far as drama is concerned. The favoured model of learning appears to change with regard to theatre.

New Learning

Fiona began by saying

' I suppose they learn something new when they come to a situation that can't be solved to full effectiveness from what they've used before, so they need to learn a new skill to cope with it. Then you discuss together what to do next.'

Most of the comments were typical of the above view, with the usual provisos about Theatre (six) and the written paper at GCSE (five). For theatre, there were comments such as 'in theatre they just have to learn what you tell them,' 'with theatre you tell them what they need to know,' 'theatre is different, there are technical things they need to know,' 'in theatre, as the teacher it's more instruction... well it *is* instruction.' The comments on the written paper at GCSE were along the lines of 'As far as I'm concerned the written paper is an English exercise and you teach them coping strategies.' Henrietta who teaches both drama and English had this to say:

'I've got quite strong feelings on this one. I actually think it's easier to learn in the drama classroom than the English classroom, if the drama is taught properly that is, because you have to be actively involved, and therefore what goes on has to be processed through your own mind. In English, you can sit there and listen to the teacher holding forth and

then you're usually involved in some writing task, when you are practically told what to write. Well I don't quite mean that, but the steps are usually mapped out for you, you know which general direction you are supposed to go in. It doesn't always have to go through the pupil's own thought processes to produce an adequate or acceptable answer... I know I'll probably annoy a lot of English teachers by saying that but if they are honest they'll know it's true, for GCSE anyway, just because of time pressure. A pupil can not speak a word in class all term and succeed in English. In drama, the pupil has to be actively involved in the process and you are forever encouraging them to go through the thought processes with the others in their group and with you as the teacher so that they learn something lasting.... That's real learning isn't it? I wish we had time for that in the English classroom but we just haven't.'

New learning in drama is again different from new learning in theatre, but according to these teachers, knowledge is not absolute.

Knowledge

At the start of their careers, eleven of the teachers were teaching drama with a very indistinct idea of content, which is closely linked to knowledge. Knowledge at this stage appeared to be 'knowing how' or learning some of the tricks of the trade, in fact, learning drama skills or learned patterns. Learning was linear. We have learned 'A' last week, so we shall learn 'B' this week. Education consisted of arranging the appropriate stimuli so that the student could make the desired associations. As we have seen from previous answers, this behavioural approach is typical of teachers' attitudes at the start of their careers until they began to change gradually to a more sociocognitive perspective.

A high number of teachers (ten) had therefore changed their views on what knowledge was with these responses being quite close to the previous answers as to what learning was and with ten making a comment to the effect that there were no absolutes. Like Fiona:

‘Knowledge is, I don’t know, having a solution, not necessarily *the* solution... at least in drama. In theatre it’s a bit different. There are rules and you have to learn them’

or Fay:

‘Knowledge is different for everyone isn’t it? Its finding your own answers from the heart.’

So, the same divisions between drama and Theatre were again apparent, as illustrated by Paul:

‘There are no absolutes in drama. How can you say to a student. “No you are wrong that doesn’t work for you in your life?” Theatre is much more technical. There are right and wrong ways of doing things and if you do those things wrong then they just don’t work. Like, you have to speak up and not turn your back on the audience and wait for other people to speak their lines and put the lighting in the right place and remember sight lines and cues, or the whole thing would be in chaos.’

A plea for structure was also made by Liz:

‘I think that knowledge is constructed, but it’s not a total free-for-all or what’s the point of having a teacher? You’ve got to have the interaction between student and teacher, which suggests that, although there may not be absolutes, there are... I don’t know what you’d call it outlines? guidelines? You’d know if a solution was utterly bizarre as a teacher and you’d intervene wouldn’t you?’

and Phil added:

‘Although there are no absolutes, its funny how students always come to the same conclusions as countless thousands have done before them.’

The idea of joint problem solving is also applied to the general response as to what education consists of.

Education

This question did not produce such long answers as to the previous questions as respondents began to think that they had covered much of this area in earlier answers. There was consequently much repetition of previous phrases used. However ten did claim to have changed their views on what education consists of over the course of their careers, with six using the phrase ‘problem-solving,’ three using the phrase ‘joint problem-solving’ and two using the phrase ‘active problem-solving’. Beth summed up the general response with:

‘Education consists of a process in which the students and the teacher are working together in a problem-solving capacity... at least that’s what it should be. Constraints of time mean that you sometimes *tell* them what they need to know.’

Written Work

Comments on the written element at GCSE were usually short and dismissive for example, ‘None of us really agrees with the written component do we?’ None of the interviewees spoke favourably about the written paper. Deborah commented:

‘...the written exam penalises students who are good at the practical work and can’t write very well. Drama used to be something those who were not very good at reading and writing could excel at. Now it’s not accepted that you can do good drama without having to write about it.’

There was general agreement with Neelands (1992) who argued that drama was not ‘deskbound’ and should not be dependent on a student’s ability to write for expression. Also Phil:

‘I believe that drama should help you become a better person and you can’t really grade that, but I recognise that it is a school subject and it therefore needs to be assessed to gain the qualification at the end. I am happy to assess a blend of Theatre and drama, but as far as I’m concerned their writing skills have already been assessed in English and therefore should not be part of the drama assessment or they (the students) end up being penalised twice for the same weakness.’

Writing skills are certainly assessed in the English National Curriculum but so are Speaking and Listening skills, which constitute drama at Key Stage Three.

National Curriculum

It was interesting to note that eight of the teachers did not consider the National Curriculum in their lesson planning at all in Key Stage Three, but the four who did were the four Heads of Faculty. Henrietta said:

‘We use the drama lessons to provide the assessment for the *Speaking and Listening* grades in the lower school.’

No one else used the National Curriculum grades in this way, but the other three Heads of Faculty all made reference to the National Curriculum objectives in their policy statements for their Department/Faculty handbooks, though Paul did comment that this was ‘window dressing for senior management and OFSTED.’ At Key Stage Four, everyone agreed that GCSE had to be followed, as it constituted the National Curriculum for 14-16 year olds.

Responses to the questions about what the National Curriculum states/implies about the various aspects of learning did not yield very deep

answers, as teachers usually ignored the National Curriculum at Key Stage Three and the answers concerning Key Stage Four were covered by earlier remarks about the GCSE syllabuses. However, it is true to say that answers were not generally positive towards the National Curriculum, which the teachers thought was 'prescriptive,' 'penalised the non-academic' and was 'insulting to the professionalism of teachers.'

Although no overt educational philosophy is claimed by the National Curriculum, nevertheless, it does reveal certain assumptions and values. For instance, the language of the document is often couched in very didactic terms. It regularly talks of what pupils 'should be encouraged to do' and what pupils 'should be taught to do.' For example, 'pupils should be taught to be fluent, accurate users of Standard English vocabulary and grammar... they should be taught to adapt their talk to suit the circumstances....' (Department For Education, 1995, p.18). What is to be taught and learned has already been determined and it represents the educational values which central government wishes to see imparted by schools.

The document assumes a behavioural approach to teaching and learning. Teachers are presented with a set of competencies to be inculcated and skills to be taught according to hierarchy of drill and practice. For students learning is the acquisition of these new skills and competencies. These new acquisitions are measured according to assessment procedures which are concerned with judging measurable outcomes at the end of each key stage.

Following the pattern of all National Curriculum subjects, assessment in English consists in testing students against a hierarchical set of levels running from 1-8. (1 the lowest, 8 the highest, plus Exceptional Performance). Each level represents the standard of attainment achieved by a student. These results are published at the end of Key Stage Three with students and their school being judged accordingly. This approach epitomises the assessment-lead curriculum which currently operates in secondary education in England and Wales.

The tendency towards a behaviourist flavour in some areas of the English National Curriculum document with its set body of knowledge and skills to

be assessed according to predetermined, measurable, hierarchical criteria gives teachers a clearly defined, but limited role. Their task is to secure the best possible performance from students measured against a set of criteria, which has been defined by government. The document says nothing about the acquisition of skills associated with drama from any of the major theorists; either Drama-in-Education theories of the art form or more theatre based theories. Nor is anything said about how Drama/English/Attainment Target One can encourage learning in the affective domain. Creativity is not mentioned.

The English National Curriculum contends that drama is a branch of English, covered for teaching and assessment purposes by Attainment Target One, *Speaking and Listening* at Key Stage Three. At Key Stage Four, there is provision for students to be assessed in drama as a separate subject at GCSE. In an English lesson, driven by the National Curriculum AT1, there is less scope for spontaneous development and probably little need for it, as the pedagogy is inevitably driven by the pre-determined level descriptors. Drama 'language' is not used in the English Attainment Target One, *Speaking and Listening*, and therefore, it is unlikely that the understanding of the required tasks will be the same. If the tasks differ, then the assessment criteria must differ also.

The existing GCSE Examination Boards' aims and objectives for drama are supposed to reflect what the National Curriculum considers to be the essentials of the subject. However, not all of the aims are clear. For example 'to enable students to appreciate and enjoy a range of drama and Theatre' is a typical example of the kind of general principle which could be applied to any subject. The terms 'drama' and 'Theatre' are used without explanation. The objectives are similar e.g. 'Demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of practical skills and techniques.' Again, no definition of terms is offered. The same could be said of the targets of Attainment Target One, *Speaking and Listening*, 'making contributions and asking questions', 'showing understanding in discussion,' and 'speaking audibly' are general points which could legitimately be applied to any other National Curriculum subject. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a subject in which these actions would *not* be useful or valid.

The effect of reducing drama to *Speaking and Listening* could disadvantage those students who do not like or are not successful in English lessons. It also potentially reduces the scope of the subject matter to a broadly English experience. The 1997-1998 OFSTED report, states that

“In English, drama is often under-represented and the contribution it makes to Speaking and Listening skills varies greatly.” (OFSTED, 1999b, p.181.)

Elliott (1991) refers to an educational system that has failed low-achieving pupils, because “their learning did not relate to any meaningful life context.” The whole content of the subject matter of drama is the life context of the students, very much a sociocognitive view.

The question is have we moved from “an assessment culture to a testing culture” (Gipps, 1994, p. 158) in which ‘performance’ is elevated to the same level as ‘competence’? Here, after Nuttall (1989), competence is defined as an improvement in knowledge, understanding and skills, which can be demonstrated again; and performance as a level of achievement reached on a single occasion. The reduction of drama to *Speaking and Listening* and the greater emphasis on the written examination at GCSE would appear to indicate the influence of the behaviourist school of assessors such as Lawlor (1989) who take a reductionist view of assessment, asserting the existence of a “high status, prescribed body of knowledge” to be transmitted to children and tested accordingly. There is no guarantee that such assessment will test anything intrinsic to the subject of drama. Instead, it could be merely a bolt-on. This is far from the view of assessment as an integral part of the curriculum with the purpose to establish learners’ potential. (Tolley, 1989)

Pearson (1998) discusses the role prescribed for Standard English within spoken language at Key Stages Three and Four. “Pupils should be taught to be fluent, accurate users of Standard English vocabulary and grammar, and to recognise its importance as the language of public communication. They should be taught to adapt their talk to suit the circumstances and to be

confident users of Standard English in informal and formal situations” (Department For Education, 1995, p.18). As Pearson (1998) observes, the assumption is that ‘command of Standard English’ is inseparable from oral skills.

The assessment criteria for GCSE grades mention Standard English throughout the full range of grades. Grade G candidates (the lowest grade) should show ‘some recognition of the functions of Standard English and at A* (the highest grade) teachers should ensure that the ‘use of Standard English is mature and assured.’ Apart from questions about whether this discriminates against pupils who have strong regional accents, there is also the question as to whether any of us always use Standard English in informal situations. More pertinent to this thesis is the idea that ‘the Standard English requirements appear to define ‘worthy’ and ‘unworthy’ forms of speech, without regard for the interest or pleasure experienced by the listener’ (Pearson, 1998 p. 15). Although these may be regarded as English concerns, they are not generally regarded to be the domain of the drama teacher.

The sociocognitive perspective of learning represented by Vygotsky and applied to drama by the DIE theorists emphasises the importance of the processes of drama over its product. Here processes are taken to mean the working out of the drama itself rather than the end result or product. For example, the planning, consultation, negotiation, practical experimentation, problem solving, evaluation and refining which have led up to the finished product, if indeed there is one. The English AT1 is outcome driven. It deals with a finished product to be assessed and measured. It provides an example of Gipps’ (1994) contention that much of assessment is to do with accountability, rather than learning.

With Heathcote’s emphasis on drama as action, the implications of describing drama solely within the parameters of the English National Curriculum are restricting for teaching and assessment. The confusion, which exists in teachers’ minds as to the nature of drama, is increased by trying to squeeze its particular skills and knowledge into English AT1. Hornbrook was opposed to the DIE practice of Heathcote etc. He thought

that DIE deprived pupils of an art form that is mainstream in our society, namely 'theatre.' With this assertion, Hornbrook re-opened the drama/theatre debate. 'Product' to Hornbrook is as important as 'process.' His theories were closer to GCSE syllabuses today than Heathcote, yet Hornbrook's arguments, which set drama in the context of theatre, still do not place the subject as a subset of English because the skills and knowledge required would not be met by English AT1; particularly as Hornbrook's view of drama as a craft would require a product.

Definitions on several counts appear to be confused. Johnson (1995) claims that there is no accepted definition of 'Standard English' and Somers (1996, p. 6) editor of *Research in Drama Education*, points out in his first editorial that 'Drama in Education' and 'Theatre in Education' "and their constituent points, bear a confusing variety of labels" and that we "need to develop a common language." This concern with definitions is echoed by Daugherty (1997) who is looking at the implications for assessment, which will face drama teachers. If teacher assessment is to regain credibility, then there is a need for quality control and questions need to be asked about judgement, moderation methods (to bring judgement into line) and consistency. His article offers a framework for the design of moderation systems and then applies the framework to a review of the ways in which the moderation of teachers' assessments have been approached in the context of National Curriculum assessment – responding to non-standard tasks under non-standard conditions. The key phrase is 'fitness for purpose.' This is crucial but often overlooked because people tend to think of the more traditional academic subjects when they think of assessment. For example, in their investigation of changes brought about by the National Curriculum, Ball et al. (1992) only concerned themselves with the core subjects of Maths, Science and English. They decided rather predictably that the pattern of the problem varies between departments.

The concept of National Curriculum 'level descriptors' depends on those who are guiding, learning and assessing students' work, namely the teachers having common interpretations of the criteria to be used and the standards to be applied when judging performance. Therefore, drama teachers need

clarity, both about their own beliefs and about the assessment requirements of the National Curriculum.

It can be seen from the above discussion that the National Curriculum has areas, particularly within assessment, which are primarily behaviourist in attitude while the teachers' perspectives seem to incline more towards a sociocognitive approach. However, the teachers did admit to beginning their careers with a more behaviourist outlook. As these were all experienced teachers who had taught before the National Curriculum (although only just in one or two cases), the thought does occur that the National Curriculum may well have older ideas of teaching and assessment, treating the subject of drama as to do with mastery of skills, which would make a mismatch of perceptions inevitable. What also indicates a mismatch is that the National Curriculum, with its tendency towards a more behaviourist perspective within assessment areas, appears to take professional expertise away from the teacher and places it in the hands of an external agent, which is inevitably detached from the context in which the learning occurs. The context in which learning occurs is vital to a sociocognitive approach.

Demographic Information

Using the demographic information provided by the interviewees I looked for differences in response from: those who just taught drama; those who taught English and drama; those who had other management responsibilities, those who were under 40 or over 40, those who were male and those who were female. The interviews revealed a gap between beliefs and practice in certain areas of teaching. Out of the current drama teaching context teachers revealed a clearly sociocognitive approach to teaching and learning. There were no teachers who adopted a behavioural model by belief. However, in practice teachers talked about adapting their style of teaching according to the subject matter. For example exploring a theme in improvisational drama would entail a sociocognitive approach, whereas teaching stage lighting inclined teachers more towards behaviourist methods. Elements of the cognitive approach were utilized for examination drama, theatre and the written tasks.

Those who taught just drama seemed, overall, to have less understanding or appreciation of whole school issues. The four teachers in more senior management positions had moved further away from the sociocognitive model in practice and had become more examination oriented. They usually did try to work more in harmony with the National Curriculum, even if they were not in agreement with it, especially those who were either engaged in or had been engaged in putting together department or Faculty handbooks, which needed to include Schemes of Work and policies on assessment, homework etc. There was no noticeable difference in attitude between male or female teachers. Those who were under 40 tended to show some impatience with some of the old arguments about theatre and drama in Education.

Conclusion

Heathcote has been regarded as the drama 'guru' by many teachers for the past thirty years or more and her definition of drama is primarily a socially constructed one following the Vygotskian notion of shared social behaviour being the first stage of learning. These DIE theories are broadly followed by practitioners such as Bolton and Neelands. Heathcote and Vygotsky both lay emphasis on the teacher interacting with the students in a developmental, even experiential way. The idea of drama as action, coupled with the emphasis on trying to get the students to experience various human situations, lends itself to a form of pedagogy where risks can be taken and the outcome is not always certain. Drama teaching and learning, in this context, consist of joint problem solving involving both teacher and student, and student and student.

For Heathcote the implications of entering into drama is that the consequences of actions and decisions will have to be faced, and, as a result of facing them, values and attitudes will be challenged and new understandings reached:

“Teaching drama involves action and interaction between adults and students. Outcomes and knowledge are reworked constantly to find meaning for each individual participant.” (Johnson and O'Neill, 1984, p. 172)

The role of the drama teacher is special as the teacher is a facilitator not an instructor. Power moves between the teacher and the student and this empowerment enables the students to create their own answers to problems. This was recognised, though perhaps not consciously by government in 1988:

“By testing and, where possible, resolving human predicaments, drama helps pupils to face intellectual, physical, social and emotional challenges.” (HMI, drama 5-16, 1988, Introduction)

Drama was supposed to equip students with skills for life. Whether this is still the case, given drama’s unclear place within the National Curriculum remains open to question.

According to Heathcote, in drama we reflect upon nature, human affairs and behaviour. That is the conditions of humanity. Heathcote regards drama as the study of how meanings are revealed and made explicit in a moment-by-moment experience of life. Heathcote’s drama makes people find precision in communication not just in speech but in various forms, including verbal, non-verbal, gesture and mime; most of which are not covered by the skills and knowledge of the English National Curriculum AT1. Heathcote stresses the use of reflection and is concerned with training in the skills of being a person in the community.

These views on the content of drama are rather general. For example, it might present something of a problem for the student teacher to have a content of ‘the conditions of humanity’ to study and learn how to teach.

Nevertheless, it has become sufficiently clear that drama is

“sufficiently distinct and different from English that it needs specialist teachers.” (Franks, 1999, pp. 39-49)

OFSTED itself acknowledges.

“The place of drama in the curriculum is an area of much discussion among specialists. Overall, they agree that it belongs in an arts curriculum, rather than in English.”
(OFSTED, 1999b, p. 181)

Shulman (1986b) wrote of the need to study teachers’ understanding of their subject and asked that

“...we pay as much attention to the content aspects of teaching as we have recently devoted to the elements of teaching process. (Shulman, 1986b, p. 8)

The idea is that specialized pedagogical subject knowledge like this informed by codified case literature would help students develop their own understanding of the subject. This perspective would support the ideas of Hornbrook (1991) who argued for a return to the study of ‘texts’ in drama teaching. Technical and theatre skills would also form part of drama’s specialized knowledge. However Hornbrook is not purely a behaviourist, he asks for the drama curriculum to include skills based learning with regard to technical and theatre skills, but this is in addition to the crafting process, where he acknowledges that some drama is ‘naturally social’ (Hornbrook, 1991). The emphasis may be different but Franks (1999) has a similarly inclusive view

“I do not want at any level, to deny that drama is important as literature, but it also has to be understood, perhaps pre-eminently as performance.” (Franks, 1999, p. 48)

Having ascertained where the theorists stand in relation to the models of learning, it is now appropriate to look at the teachers.

Drama is regarded by teachers as a constructed activity as it involves learners continually reforming and restructuring their knowledge and understanding of the various aspects of the subject. It becomes a socially constructed activity because it is set within the context of collaborative learning involving action and interaction amongst people each bringing their

own social perspective to the group. The participants bring their own views of society to the lesson however rudimentary these views are in the case of children. It also became clear from the teachers' responses that making drama cannot consist of merely writing about it. It contains performance and thinking components, which need to be exercised, practised and refined with the assistance of the teacher who, by definition, has greater expertise than the students.

The behaviourist perception of a teacher instructing passive students or the cognitive view of teacher as 'expert' does not appear to fit with this perception. In drama, once the teacher has outlined the task to the students they expect the response to be worked on, shaped, reconsidered and shared.

On becoming involved in the training of drama teachers, Heathcote declared the need to train teachers to provide the structure for a learning situation to happen, rather than a transmitting of information in a 'final' way for learning to take place. Teachers have to be trained to withhold their expertise, and to give students the opportunities to grapple with problems before they come to the teacher for solutions and, instead, to reach an answer because of the work they do rather than because of the listening they have done. For Heathcote the teacher operates from within the creative and educational process rather than from outside. For her, the teacher's role in the drama lesson is to be involved in 'significant selection' so that action is representative of an event but does not necessarily reveal all of that event. The work that the students 'do' in this sense is the practical work of drama, the 'action' which is characteristic of drama and which distinguishes it from many English activities including those described in the English National Curriculum, Attainment Target One. Again, there is no room for the passive learner. The learner is 'active' at all times. Hornbrook (1989) may regard a drama lesson like this as depriving students of access to an art form. Instead he might advocate an engagement with cultural and historical influences as crucial.

The sociocognitive stance described by Vygotsky requires teachers to take on an enhanced role in the learning process. This ascribes to the teacher the role of enabler concerned as much with assessing potential as measuring

progress. The teacher acknowledges the pupil's prior learning and seeks to intervene when the ZPD is reached, so that assistance is provided to enhance performance. This is done by providing 'scaffolding' (Bruner, 1989) so that the task can be broken down into particular aspects or by using prompting questions. Here the importance of language is emphasised. Learning does not occur as a result of simple stimuli and responses with a correct answer as the result. The student tries to understand actively the environment but goes beyond this in the shared social behaviour which comes to fruition in the zone of proximal development, which is particularly relevant for learners in the drama classroom where a dynamic process is needed and where learning is not passive but is based on action.

I expected to find much more of a debate going on about the two issues of process/product and drama/theatre and at first there appeared to be. However on closer examination, I found that although there were teachers at opposing ends of the two divides, the majority of teachers opted for a balance, with an acceptance that drama and Theatre were aspects of the same experience and that both the process and the product were important for the learner.

With regard to the literature again I found moderation in approach. Teachers were generally admirers of Heathcote and her teaching methods, but also gave credence to the ideas of Hornbrook. That is, they had all heard of Heathcote and mentioned her by name. They were not generally familiar with the name of Hornbrook but wanted to include theatre in their drama programmes, agreeing that theatre was and should be part of the subject matter of a drama education.

Where teachers stand on the debates of the major theorists is reflected in their use of DIE terminology when describing their own practice. However, they also, although less frequently, use expressions which could also be attributed to Hornbrook's approach. This may be because such views are more in line with the dictates of the National Curriculum, which they are obligated to teach.

The views of the teachers in the field generally tend to reveal a sociocognitive approach to learning and assessment for drama teaching. However, with regard to the theatre elements of the courses, they tend to reflect a more behavioural approach with some elements of the cognitive model. The National Curriculum tends to reflect a more behaviourist approach to content, learning on occasions, more particularly in the area of assessment.

A mismatch is indicated between the views of DIE theorists with the National Curriculum. It therefore follows that teachers who subscribe to this view of drama teaching will also find a disparity. There is less of a discrepancy between the teaching of theatre and the National Curriculum.

5. CONCLUSION

Where do teachers' stand on the debates of the major theorists for the field with regard to the definition/content of drama teaching?

Discussion of content revealed tensions between two schools of thought, namely the Drama-In-Education theory of Heathcote and the Dramatic Art theory of Hornbrook; both theories being inextricably bound up with the question of drama's content base. These experienced teachers beliefs' find their basis in the DIE theories, but these beliefs have developed along with current practice, which necessarily includes theatre because of the requirements of the relevant syllabuses.

The problem of the Drama-in-Education method, in which the students learn about the content through the drama, is that the students must know how to access the content. That is, they have to learn the 'drama conventions' or the mechanics of how the art form works. In this way, it could be argued that content is not paramount if the student is learning dramatic form. For example, there is a variety of texts for the English teacher to select from but it is not material whether Julius Caesar or Macbeth is studied, as long as the students take away from the lessons literary skills, which they can apply in the future. When such an outlook is applied to the creation of meaning, the position for drama also becomes clearer:

'Work in the arts is meaning embodied; any cognition of the content being inextricably bound-up with an apprehension of its artistic form.' (Kempe, 1999)

Kempe's assertion follows McNamara (1991) who also contends that the pedagogy is inextricable from the content knowledge. In addition, Marks (1990) states that one of the sources of content knowledge is pedagogy itself. Whether the meaning is created for oneself or others, it is embedded in the art form; that is the appropriate drama or theatre skills and also partly created in the teaching. Hornbrook extends this skill base by insisting on an engagement with the attributes of theatre. Although, Drama is regarded as useful for the teaching of Life or Social Skills, exploration of any issues

would still require an engagement with this skill base. In this way, drama is a useful teaching tool, but to regard it solely in this light is to deny its existence as a unique art form.

The teachers generally held the beliefs of the Drama-In-Education theorists with regard to the definition/content of drama teaching. Where drama was taught as a discrete subject at Key Stage Three, outside the bounds of the English National Curriculum, it was the DIE methods which were used. A pragmatic approach to Key Stage Four was adopted, which meant that teachers taught to the demands of the GCSE syllabus. There was some indication that this may have resulted in a shift in beliefs concerning the inclusion of theatre. This in turn may have affected teachers' views on learning and assessment of drama.

Do the views of teachers in the field reflect a behavioural, cognitive or Sociocognitive approach to learning and assessment?

On interviewing teachers, few showed any familiarity with the terms used in connection with different models of learning. Only one teacher used the terms 'behaviourist' or 'sociocognitive' (actually "socio-constructivist") with any confidence, and it was the same teacher who mentioned Vygotsky. Teachers' beliefs lag behind sociocognitive theories of learning generally, but drama teachers have the advantage of teaching a subject which lends itself readily to the sociocognitive approach, which they are using without actually naming it as such. Other teachers' beliefs with regard to teaching and learning were made by inference.

In general, teachers began their training with behaviourist views, learned a more sociocognitive approach on their training courses and then reverted to a more behaviourist approach in the field, endorsing Wubbels (1992) contention about the gap between theory and practice in teacher training. However, whilst this was accurate for examination drama, this did not hold true in the lower school where without the constraints of a syllabus a more sociocognitive approach was still used. The Vygotskian approach, with its accent on the social and the idea of the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1987) was found to be a good match for drama in Key Stage

Three. Indeed Rogoff's (1990) account of cognitive apprenticeship was a very accurate description of the Key Stage Three drama classroom, when drama does not include many elements of theatre. While the sociocognitive model was favoured in theory, at Key Stage Four the cognitive approach was also in evidence with regard to the learning of drama conventions, problem solving and creativity and, within the theatre elements when the teacher took on the role of 'expert.'

A more behaviourist approach was used by most teachers for the mastery of technical theatre skills. The sociocognitive approach was also at odds with drama teaching: when assessment emphasis was placed on the product, when drama was seen as part of English in the National Curriculum and treated as oracy and at GCSE when drama included written tasks, or essays, which were seen as the preserve of the English department. In these circumstances, the teachers' generally sociocognitive views on learning and assessment were at variance with their practice.

Which orientation to content, learning and assessment is reflected by the National Curriculum?

The National Curriculum as part of the government's testing regime inclines towards a behaviourist approach with its GCSE syllabus set of competencies for drama. At its most liberal, it posits a cognitive approach with its ideas on transmission of knowledge to students and where teachers are seen as instructors. Under such a model, it is far easier to place drama in the English National Curriculum. Yet, if drama is separate and important, it must have unique skills and be sure of its own status. One of the problems is that, because of its placement within English in Key Stage Three

"Senior managers in some secondary schools still suffer from the notion that anyone can teach drama - a drama lesson tagged onto each English teacher's timetable is seen to meet the requirements of the National Curriculum."
(Griffin, 1996, p. 4),

which is in opposition to the findings of McGuinn (1995) and Harland (2000)

“all the lessons identified as demonstrating ‘effective practice’ were taught by specialist teachers with high levels of personal involvement, passion and commitment to the art form.” (Harland, 2000, p. 569)

This is the difficulty with seeing drama as a branch of English. It is true that the requirements of the National Curriculum can easily be met this way, but some of the more behaviourist approaches embedded in National Curriculum assessment make it a poorer match for drama with its previously sociocognitive approach to learning. Whilst theatre is an easier fit, it is not usually introduced into the curriculum until GCSE when drama emerges from the aegis of English and becomes a subject in its own right again. There is general acceptance amongst teachers of the integration of theatre and technical skills at GCSE, but uniform hostility to the written papers in the GCSE syllabuses which, it is felt, go over ground already covered by English and thus disadvantages non-academic students.

With regard to assessment: At Key Stage Three, drama is seen as only one of a range of *Speaking and Listening* skills. The National Curriculum level descriptors depend upon teachers having common interpretations of the criteria to be used and the standards to be applied, which is plainly not the case. Moreover, these criteria are bound up with the notion of ‘correct’ or ‘Standard’ English, which as Johnson (1995) says, has no accepted definition. Although the notions of creativity, imagination and feeling are all mentioned in the OFSTED (1993) handbook, such concepts are not always apparent within the suggested assessment tasks. These concentrate on students being able to use drama ‘concepts’ and drama ‘skills’ appropriately. At Key Stage Four, assessment is detached from the teachers and given to an external agent.

Is there a mismatch between the views embodied by the major theorists, teachers and the National Curriculum?

Despite the fact that all of the teachers interviewed began teaching in the era of educational drama, when theatre was regarded as a completely separate subject, there was universal acceptance that theatre was a valid part of

drama, especially at GCSE. In the same way that English happily accepts its division into English Language and English Literature, so drama appears now to be accepting the two branches of the subject, Drama and Theatre, under the umbrella title of Drama. This provides an illustration of Wittgenstein's (1953) theory of there being 'family resemblances' between ideas, rather than every aspect of drama and every aspect of theatre having all facets in common and therefore being permitted to be acknowledged as one subject. Furthermore, Hornbrook's (1989) plea that students be allowed access to the art form is realised by the inclusion of both text and theatre skills. Moreover, if it is accepted that learning drama means that students engage with the dramatic art form, then learning drama must involve learning to act, despite the contention of Heathcote that there is 'never any acting involved.' Similarly, skills such as lighting, sound, make-up and set design, if they are helping with effective communication, must be learned and mastered. The shift in teachers' beliefs, which only became apparent in the in depth interviews, makes the above scenario a more likely future prospect. One in which an integrated and inclusive approach (Fleming, 2000) unifies content, form, the personal, the cultural, the internal, the external, the process and the product.

The greatest mismatch came within the area of assessment. These problems mainly arose from two areas. Firstly, uncertainty about content and secondly, from constraints placed on methods of assessment. Teachers were happy to apply effort and attainment grades at Key Stage Three and GCSE grades were determined by the syllabuses. However, it was felt that a broader scope of assessment was needed (Torrance, 1995) and that subjective or intuitive judgement (Treacher, 1989) was appropriate in some cases, particularly when drama entered the affective domain and where it was felt that teachers' instinctive professional opinions should be respected. Drama teachers tended to use more of a 'praise culture' in their classrooms, where students were both encouraged and felt safe to take creative risks (Harland, 2000). Ross et al (1993) asserted that how students learn is as important as what they learn and therefore the process was equally as important as the product. Hornbrook (1989) himself would agree with this contention. Self-assessment is advocated by Harlen and James (1997) and Valencia (1998) argues for action-orientated self-assessment tasks, which

are a good match for drama. Maybe, drama assessment should not be limited to a consideration of linguistic intelligence, but should perhaps look at other types of intelligence such as bodily kinaesthetic or interpersonal. (Gardner, 1983) After much debate, it was felt by teachers that equal weighting should be given to the process and the product.

Teachers can find a match with certain aspects of all the major theorists as is demonstrated by their classroom practice. However, teachers do not want drama to be considered a branch of English in the National Curriculum, with its emphasis on 'correct' ways of speaking and do not want a written paper for examination at GCSE which they feel re-tests English skills and disadvantages those who are able in drama but not in English. The greatest mismatch appears to arise from this bracketing of the two subjects, where the drama teacher wishes to go beyond the mastery of skills to a qualitative assessment of the psychological and creative processes. So that it is in the area of assessment where the greatest mismatch occurs between the views embodied by the major theorists, teachers and the National Curriculum.

Teachers' Beliefs

As a high proportion of these experienced drama teachers began their teaching careers as English teachers, and as the orthodoxy of that time (1970s) was the DIE approach, it is debateable whether these teachers gravitated towards drama teaching because they had beliefs conversant with the sociocognitive perspectives or developed a sociocognitive outlook because they taught educational drama. In this vein, Nespor (1992) demonstrated how beliefs are bound up in teachers' wider belief systems. Moving on to management responsibility had also changed practice for some of these participants but the question was had it changed their beliefs? Cornett (1990) has shown how teachers sometimes use different actions in different contexts, revealing contradictory beliefs. Galton et al. (1980) also talk about this occasional discrepancy between beliefs and classroom practice and Elbaz (1983) writes of the eclectic nature of teachers' beliefs, which are seen as experiential and continually developing. This is illustrated by the shift in attitudes to the teaching of drama. While it is clear that the GCSE requirements necessitated the inclusion of theatre in drama teaching, this change corresponded with the writings of Hornbrook (1989). Thus

generating questions about whether Hornbrook was reflecting a sea change of beliefs about drama teaching at the time or whether the National Curriculum changes altered beliefs. Smith and Neale (1989) show how beliefs are discovery oriented and Richardson (2000) writes of the constant interaction between beliefs and practice, so that beliefs about drama teaching could be slowly altered over time or as Anning (1988) would claim, drama theory could be reformulated through practice. To date drama teachers could be teaching with no rationale of their own, for as Calderhead (1988) observed teachers generally have simple, restricted accounts of their practice. In answer to this Freeman (1991b) wrote of how teachers need to share their beliefs and terminology. If this were to take place in a structured way, what is now implicit about drama teaching could become explicit and policy formulated accordingly.

Limitations

Much of the research on teachers' beliefs was American and a high proportion was conducted in the primary sector. Very little research I read concerned drama, most of the research was mainly conducted within the core subjects of English, Mathematics and Science. In these cases, the traditional idea of the deskbound classroom or the science laboratory were always used for examples

There was also a difference between the questionnaire responses and the interviews because data collected were not sensitive enough to the issues. It was not until a long way into the interviews that some teachers began to admit to or even discover, that they had in fact changed their beliefs and attitudes to the teaching of drama in recent years, in some cases without overtly realising this.

My study did not reflect the views of younger or newly qualified teachers because as I wanted to assess the impact of the National Curriculum, it was important to interview teachers who had been teaching before its implementation. However, this later became a limitation of the study, as more recent attitudes towards some important considerations in drama have not been recorded.

Future Research

Research could be undertaken with younger, less experienced teachers, concerning their beliefs and practice in drama teaching. I would like to examine current attitudes to drama, perhaps in the teacher training institutions. There were signs that the teacher trainers were sociocognitive in approach, yet trainees were made to pass a set of competencies to become qualified and secondary school teaching follows a transmission model of teaching. There is also the consideration that Drama does not have to rest either with English or on its own. It could be located within either expressive or performing arts (These two are different and link with the distinction between drama and theatre). The curriculum development work of Rex Gibson, Director of the Shakespeare and Schools Project, may also provide fruitful area of exploration, considering Shakespeare's revered place within the English National Curriculum.

Implications

Drama wants to remain a discrete subject at Key Stage Four and reclaim lost ground at Key Stage Three. For this to occur practically, drama must redefine itself clearly to curriculum developers at all levels and formulate methods of assessment, which are acceptable to both teachers and examination boards. This research has show how teachers' beliefs change and adapt. The mismatch with the National Curriculum, although contentious, has helped drama along the road to reformulating itself, but this new outward appearance needs clearer definition and expression amongst teachers themselves.

GCSE EXAMINATION BOARDS' ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE 2001/2

SEG*: DRAMA AND THEATRE ARTS

Two practical components 60% - These do not have to be drama (can be design and technical skills)

One written examination 40% - review of a play/review of a live performance/review of own practical work

MEG**: DRAMA AND THEATRE ARTS

Two practical components 60% - These do not have to be drama (can be design and technical skills)

One written examination 40% - review of a play or own practical work.

LONDON EDEXCEL: DRAMA

Two practical components 80% - Improvisation/Performance (can be design and technical skills)

One written component 20% - Evaluative Commentary. (Four units of work)

NEAB: DRAMA AND THEATRE ARTS

Two practical components 80% - Improvisation/Performance (can be design and technical skills)

One written component 20% - Evaluative Commentary.

* Now AQA

**Now OCR.

KEY STAGES 3 AND 4 PROGRAMME OF STUDY

Pupils' abilities should be developed within an integrated programme of speaking and listening, reading and writing. Pupils should be given opportunities that interrelate the requirements of the Range, Key Skills, and Standard English and Language Study sections.

Speaking and Listening

■ 1. Range

- a Pupils should be given opportunities to talk for a range of purposes, including:
 - explanation, description and narration;
 - exploration and hypothesis;
 - consideration of ideas, literature and the media;
 - argument, debate and persuasion;
 - the development of thinking;
 - analysis.
- b Pupils should be given opportunities to talk in a range of contexts, including those that are more formal. They should be encouraged to adapt their presentation to different audiences and to reflect on how their talk varies.
- c Pupils should be encouraged to listen attentively, both in situations where they remain mostly silent and where they have the opportunity to respond immediately. They should be taught to distinguish features of presentation where the intention is to be explanatory, persuasive, amusing or argumentative, and should be taught to use this knowledge when preparing and presenting their own oral work.
- d Pupils should be given opportunities to participate in a wide range of drama activities, including role-play, and in the performance of scripted and unscripted plays. Pupils should be encouraged to develop both their communication skills and their ability to evaluate language use. In responding to drama, they should be given opportunities to consider significant features of their own and others' performances.

■ 2. Key Skills

- a Pupils should be given opportunities to make different types of contributions in discussion, adapting their speech to their listeners and to the activity. They should be encouraged to structure their talk clearly, judging the appropriate level of detail, and using a range of markers to aid the listener. They should be taught to use gesture and intonation appropriately. In discussions, they should be encouraged to take different views into account, sift, summarise and use salient points, cite evidence and construct persuasive arguments. In taking different roles in group discussions, pupils should be introduced to ways of negotiating consensus or agreeing to differ. They should be given opportunities to consider their choice of words and the effectiveness of their expression.

English
Key Stages
3 and 4
Speaking and
Listening

- b** In order to develop as effective listeners, pupils should be taught to identify the major elements of what is being said, and to distinguish tone, undertone, implications and other indicators of a speaker's intentions. They should be taught to notice ambiguities, deliberate vagueness, glossing over points, use and abuse of evidence, and unsubstantiated statements. In discussion, pupils should listen and respond. They should be encouraged to make contributions that clarify and synthesise others' ideas, taking them forward and building on them to reach a conclusion. Pupils should be encouraged to ask and answer questions and to modify their ideas in the light of what others say.

■ 3. Standard English and Language Study

- a** Pupils should be taught to be fluent, accurate users of standard English vocabulary and grammar, and to recognise its importance as the language of public communication. They should be taught to adapt their talk to suit the circumstances, and to be confident users of standard English in formal and informal situations. In role-play and drama, the vocabulary, structures and tone appropriate to such contexts should be explored.
- b** Pupils should be given opportunities to consider the development of English, including:
 - how usage, words and meanings change over time;
 - how words and parts of words are borrowed from other languages;
 - the coinage of new words and the origins of existing words;
 - current influences on spoken and written language;
 - attitudes to language use;
 - the differences between speech and writing;
 - the vocabulary and grammar of standard English and dialectal variations.

Attainment Target 1: Speaking and Listening

■ Level 1

Pupils talk about matters of immediate interest. They listen to others and usually respond appropriately. They convey simple meanings to a range of listeners, speaking audibly, and begin to extend their ideas or accounts by providing some detail.

■ Level 2

Pupils begin to show confidence in talking and listening, particularly where the topics interest them. On occasions, they show awareness of the needs of the listener by including relevant detail. In developing and explaining their ideas they speak clearly and use a growing vocabulary. They usually listen carefully and respond with increasing appropriateness to what others say. They are beginning to be aware that in some situations a more formal vocabulary and tone of voice are used.

■ Level 3

Pupils talk and listen confidently in different contexts, exploring and communicating ideas. In discussion, they show understanding of the main points. Through relevant comments and questions, they show they have listened carefully. They begin to adapt what they say to the needs of the listener, varying the use of vocabulary and the level of detail. They are beginning to be aware of standard English and when it is used.

■ Level 4

Pupils talk and listen with confidence in an increasing range of contexts. Their talk is adapted to the purpose: developing ideas thoughtfully, describing events and conveying their opinions clearly. In discussion, they listen carefully, making contributions and asking questions that are responsive to others' ideas and views. They use appropriately some of the features of standard English vocabulary and grammar.

■ Level 5

Pupils talk and listen confidently in a wide range of contexts, including some that are of a formal nature. Their talk engages the interest of the listener as they begin to vary their expression and vocabulary. In discussion, they pay close attention to what others say, ask questions to develop ideas and make contributions that take account of others' views. They begin to use standard English in formal situations.

■ Level 6

Pupils adapt their talk to the demands of different contexts with increasing confidence. Their talk engages the interest of the listener through the variety of its vocabulary and expression. Pupils take an active part in discussion, showing understanding of ideas and sensitivity to others. They are usually fluent in their use of standard English in formal situations.

■ Level 7

Pupils are confident in matching their talk to the demands of different contexts. They use vocabulary precisely and organise their talk to communicate clearly. In discussion, pupils make significant contributions, evaluating others' ideas and varying how and when they participate. They show confident use of standard English in situations that require it.

■ Level 8

Pupils maintain and develop their talk purposefully in a range of contexts. They structure what they say clearly, using apt vocabulary and appropriate intonation and emphasis. They make a range of contributions which show that they have listened perceptively and are sensitive to the development of discussion. They show confident use of standard English in a range of situations, adapting as necessary.

■ Exceptional performance

Pupils select and use structures, styles and registers appropriately in a range of contexts, varying their vocabulary and expression confidently for a range of purposes. They initiate and sustain discussion through the sensitive use of a variety of contributions. They take a leading role in discussion and listen with concentration and understanding to varied and complex speech. They show assured and fluent use of standard English in a range of situations and for a variety of purposes.

Past Experience

1. How would you describe your life up to becoming a teacher?
2. How did you become a teacher?
3. Why did you choose to teach drama?
4. Would you tell me about your experiences as a student teacher of drama?
5. Would you tell me about your early experiences in schools?

Present Experience

6. How much drama do you teach?
7. What else do you teach/have you taught?
8. What is the relationship between drama and any other subject in your school?
9. What INSET training do you get as a drama teacher?
10. What is the most satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?
11. What is the least satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?

Reflections on Meaning

12. Tell me about your drama teaching?
13. Do you think drama has a content?
14. What do you think about the process/product debate?
15. Do you include 'theatre' skills in your drama teaching?
16. How do you assess students?
17. Do you consider the English National Curriculum at all in your lesson planning?
18. Where do you see yourself going in the future?

CHANGES MADE TO QUESTIONNAIRE

I made the following changes to the questionnaire after the pilot, following feedback from the participants: -

- In Section A, question one '*The* long term aim of drama teaching...' was changed to '*A* long term aim...' Participants suggested that, whereas they would agree that it was an important aim, that there were other aims which they would regard as equally important.
- Question three, the word 'active' was italicised, so that the importance of the word was emphasised for clarity.
- Question four 'The most important aim...' was changed to 'An important aim...' Again, respondents were unhappy with the use of the definite article.
- Question five. A definition of the terms 'theatre' and 'drama' were included to help avoid different interpretation of terms.
- Question eight was seen to be almost identical to question one and was therefore deleted.
- Section B, question eight was changed from 'I do not agree....' to 'I agree...' to avoid the confusion of a possible double negative in response.

GLOSSARY of TERMS

Drama	<p>This is contentious.</p> <p><i>If taken as separate from theatre, variously regarded as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active exploration of the world at a metaphorical level. • Active and imaginative engagement with some form of stimulus. • Actively trying to experience a situation and then reflecting upon that experience. • A learning tool.
Art Form	An established medium of artistic expression..
Drama Conventions	The different ways of working used to solve dramatic problems. E.g.- freeze-framing, hot-seating, improvisation, mime, re-enactments, role play, role reversal, tableaux, thought tracking etc.
Process	Working out of ideas and exploration of dramatic problems. Work in progress.
Product	Finished, polished performance.
Technical Skills	Costume, Lighting, Make-up, Masks, Properties, Set Design and Construction, Sound, Stage Management etc.
Theatre	<p>Finished performance for an audience.</p> <p>Learning of performance and presentation skills.</p>
Theatre Skills	Stage Technique, Voice Production, Presentation Skills etc.
INSET	In Service Training
QCA	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
R.O.A.	Record of Achievement
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
SATs	Standard Assessment Tasks

RESULTS Of INTERVIEW PILOT (6-11)

(Present Experience)

Question	Teacher A	Teacher B
6.How much drama do you teach?	100% of timetable	88% of timetable
7. What else do you teach/have you taught?	Have taught English in the past.	English 12% of timetable.
8. What is the relationship between drama and any other subject in your school?	Discrete subject on timetable.	Part of a Faculty of English and Performing Arts
9. What INSET training do you get as a drama teacher?	“Very little, that is subject specific, from the school” “Some by the GCSE exam board”	“None specifically as a drama teacher”
10.What is the most satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?	“Seeing non-academic pupils achieve”	“Watching students develop and utilise drama skills”
11.What is the least satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?	“Fighting for curriculum time”	“Having to provide the English KS3 assessment grades”

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW PILOT (12-18)

Question	Teacher A	Teacher B
12. Tell me about your drama teaching	"I see myself as a facilitator helping with problem-solving"	"I see myself as a facilitator, helping pupils find their own solutions"
13. Do you think drama has a content?	"Not really. It's about teaching social skills and self confidence"	"Well yes they have to learn skills, like the 'drama Conventions'"
14. What do you think about the process/product debate?	"Team work is very important. It's more important than the outcome"	"The process is important but I think that the product is too"
15. Do you include 'theatre' skills in your drama teaching?	"If the pupil chooses a theatre skill for GCSE then you have to teach it"	"Only at GCSE level. It's on the syllabus"
16. How do you assess students?	"At KS3 we just use an effort grade" "At KS4 we go by the syllabus"	"At KS3 we need a grade to go on the 'Record of Achievement' so it's really about co-operation in lessons" At KS4 I suppose it's the syllabus"
17. Do you consider the English National Curriculum at all in your lesson planning?	"No, I don't even know what the requirements are" "It's nothing to do with us"	"Yes we have to. We provide all the KS3 oral grades for English, but they are oral skills not drama skills"
18. Where do you see yourself going in the future?	"Nowhere. I just want to carry on doing what I am doing"	"I want to be a Deputy Head"

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. The following information would also be helpful to me in carrying out this study.

Confidentiality is assured.

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Name of present school
4. Years teaching experience
5. Number of schools worked in
6. Number of LEAs worked for
7. Qualifications (initial)
8. Further accredited study
9. Age range of students taught
10. Key Stages taught in drama

Thank you once again for your co-operation, which is greatly appreciated.

The Teaching and Assessment of drama

Thank you for agreeing to fill in this questionnaire. Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected at all times. Please read the following statements and tick your response in the columns on the right.

<u>Section A</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. A long-term aim of drama teaching is for students to understand themselves and the world in which they live.				
2. Physical, emotional and intellectual identification with fictitious situations is dramatic activity.				
3. <i>Active</i> involvement and identification with a fictitious situation is unique to drama				
4. An important aim of drama teaching is for students to achieve an understanding and appreciation of the medium of drama.				
5. Drama is a separate subject from Theatre. *				
6. Drama GCSE syllabuses should include Theatre Skills				
7. A drama teacher should enable the student to create his or her own answers to problems.				
8. Drama is an art form.				
9. Assessment in drama should test knowledge and understanding of taught drama skills.				
10. Assessment in drama should test performance skills.				
11. Assessment in drama should test English skills.				
12. Assessment in drama should include technical theatre skills (lighting, costume, set design etc.)				
13. Assessment in drama should be primarily formative (Diagnostic to enable further learning.				
14. Assessment in drama should be primarily summative. (Specific task for recording performance at a particular time.)				

* Where drama is defined as an active and imaginative engagement with some form of stimulus and Theatre is defined as the learning of performance and presentation skills.

<u>Section B</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The National Curriculum rightly promotes the curriculum objectives of both drama and English (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>)				
2. The shift in assessment weighting in GCSE drama from the practical to the written is a good thing.				
3. The National Curriculum has caused the distinction between drama and English to become blurred because the two subjects are regarded as one.				
4. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) promotes curriculum objectives, which are specifically related to drama.				
5. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) ignores curriculum objectives which are specifically related to drama,				
6. The objectives of English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) are general and could be applied to almost any National Curriculum subject.				
7. English Attainment Target One (<i>Speaking and Listening</i>) makes the assessment of drama easier for teachers because of the specific objectives.				
8. I agree with the equation of English oral skills with drama skills in <i>Speaking and Listening</i> .				

<u>Section C</u>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Drama can only be taught effectively as a subject distinct from English.				
2. Drama has separate core skills and knowledge from English.				
3. I am confused about what English and drama assessment objectives require.				
4. I find the specific objectives of the National Curriculum helpful in planning my lessons.				
5. I find myself too limited by the objectives of the National Curriculum.				
6. I prefer teaching drama now, after the introduction of the National Curriculum.				
7. Having written work to mark helps my overall assessment of the student.				
8. Assessing a student purely on practical work is not sufficient for a full consideration of their drama skills.				
9. Assessment in drama should be focused on the process of the students' work and not the product.				

LETTER TO SCHOOLS

Name

Address

February 1999

Dear Colleague,

I am a practising teacher, at the ***** School, Cambridge and am conducting doctoral research into drama teacher’s perspectives on the teaching and assessment of drama.

I would be very grateful if you would take the time to fill in the enclosed questionnaire. I think the results would be of interest to both drama and English teachers. I can assure you of complete confidentiality and am happy to share the results of my research with you on completion. You may, of course, withdraw at any time. I hope that you will feel able to help me with my research and I enclose a stamped addressed envelope for your convenience.

Yours sincerely

Please tick:	Yes	No
If you would like to know the results of this study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If you would be interested in participating in a follow up interview	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Interview One (Past Experience)

1. How would you describe your professional life up to becoming a teacher?
2. How did you become a teacher?
3. Why did you choose to teach drama?
4. Would you tell me something about your experiences as a student teacher of drama?
5. Would you tell me about your early experiences in schools?
6. When you started teaching did you have any views/theories about drama in respect of: a) The Learner? b) How learning occurs? c) What learning is? d) What knowledge is? e) How new learning occurs? f) What education consists of? g) How to assess?

Interview Two (Present Experience)

1. How much drama do you teach? No of classes? Key stages covered?
2. Do you teach any other subject?
3. What is the relationship between drama and any other subject in your school in terms of curriculum structure?
4. What INSET training do you get as a drama teacher?
5. What is the most satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?
6. What is the least satisfying part of your work as a drama teacher?
7. Now that you have taught for some years, have you changed your views on drama in respect of: a) The Learner? b) How learning occurs? c) What learning is? d) What knowledge is? e) How new learning occurs? f) What education consists of? g) How to assess?

Interview Three (Reflections on Meaning)

1. What do you think the role of the teacher is in a drama lesson?
2. Do you think that drama has its own subject content and if so what is it?
3. How is this content delivered to students?
4. What do you think about the process/product debate?
5. Do you think that 'drama' and 'Theatre' are separate subjects?
6. Do you include 'theatre' skills in your drama teaching?
7. How do you assess students?
8. How do you think students should be assessed?
9. Do you think that assessment should include written work?
10. Do you consider the English National Curriculum at all in your lesson planning?
11. What do you think the National Curriculum states/implies about: a) The learner? b) How learning occurs? c) What learning is? d) What knowledge is? e) How new learning occurs? f) What education is?
12. Where do you see drama teaching going in the future?

Summary of the specification content

Paper	Title	Description
1	Drama Coursework (60%) Unit 1: Drama Exploration I Teacher-assessed practical work supported by a portfolio of documentary evidence	<p>This unit of coursework is concerned with the use of drama to explore ideas and issues in response to stimulus material selected from different times and cultures. Students have the opportunity to use drama forms to deepen their knowledge and understanding of an idea or issue and to communicate this understanding through the medium of drama.</p> <p>The assessment activities for this unit are set and marked by the teacher within prescribed guidelines.</p>
	Unit 2: Drama Exploration II Teacher-assessed practical work supported by a portfolio of documentary evidence	<p>This unit of coursework is concerned with the exploration of a complete and substantial play chosen by the centre. The purpose of this unit is to give students knowledge and understanding of the ways in which playwrights, performers, directors and designers use the medium of drama to communicate their ideas to an audience.</p> <p>The assessment activities for this unit are set and marked by the teacher within prescribed guidelines.</p>
2	Drama Performance (40%) Externally assessed practical examination of ONE of the following options: Option A: Devised performance or Option B: Performance support or Option C: Scripted performance	<p>This paper is concerned with the skills required in drama to perform work to an audience. Students have the opportunity to demonstrate their skills as performers or in a theatre craft using any appropriate material as a stimulus for performance. For option C, the stimulus must be a play script.</p> <p>The assessment activities for this paper are set by the teacher within prescribed guidelines and are externally marked.</p>

Summary of scheme of assessment

Paper	Mode of assessment	Weighting
1	<p>Two units of practical coursework.</p> <p>Unit 1 is about using drama to explore themes and issues in response to at least two different texts chosen from different times and cultures. This is accompanied by supporting documentary evidence.</p> <p>Unit 2 is about exploring a complete and substantial play, chosen by the centre, from the point of view of directors, performers and/or designers, accompanied by a portfolio of appropriate supporting documentary evidence.</p> <p>This paper is internally assessed and externally moderated.</p>	60%
2	<p>A practical examination of a performing or technical support role within the context of the performance of a devised or scripted play to an audience.</p> <p>This paper is externally assessed.</p>	40%

Specification content

Paper 1: Drama coursework

60% internally assessed and externally moderated

Assessment focus:

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of drama through:

- AO1 **responding** to ideas and issues in different contexts, demonstrating an appropriate use of drama to communicate meaning to others
- AO2 **developing** and exploring ideas using appropriate forms to structure them into a meaningful piece of drama work
- AO4 **evaluating** the effectiveness of their own drama work and the work of others and recognising the significance of historical, cultural and/or social influences.

Unit 1: Drama exploration I

Study for this unit will include:

- exploring the dramatic potential of a range of ideas and issues
- responding to a range of texts from different times and cultures
- making comparisons and connections between texts
- shaping ideas to communicate meaning through the medium of drama
- selecting appropriate drama forms in the structuring of a piece of drama
- recording ideas for drama in the form of scripts, scenarios and/or story boards
- gaining a practical understanding of a range of drama forms
- evaluating the effectiveness of the individual's drama work and that of others
- developing performing, devising and improvisation skills
- developing and realising ideas within a group
- using the language of drama to communicate ideas to others.

Content

In this coursework unit, the emphasis is on students developing an understanding of ideas and issues through drama and using the medium and elements of drama to structure their responses into a meaningful piece of work. The ideas and responses will arise from different kinds of texts explored during the course. The texts will enable students to make connections and comparisons across different times and cultures. Within this unit, the work is intended to have meaning for the participants and is not intended for performance to a theatre audience. The work produced for this unit may, however, be developed and used as the material for the devised performance or performance support options in Paper 2 (Drama Performance).

Part of the process of teaching this unit will include sharing work in progress with others and responding to constructive feedback.

Teachers will provide a programme of study that will:

- enable students to engage in the range of drama activities listed below
- explore a range of texts chosen across different times and cultures
- offer opportunities for students to make connections and comparisons between texts.

Students will be required to call upon their learning acquired during the programme of study in their response to the final assessment tasks.

Programme of study

The programme of study will introduce students to the following:

a Explorative strategies

- **Still image** (one person acts as a sculptor and creates images by positioning individuals in the group in relation to one another to create a still image)
- **Thought-tracking** (stopping individuals during an in-role activity and asking them to reveal their inner thoughts at a particular moment)
- **Narrating** (providing a spoken commentary that accompanies stage action, or a story being related by a character)
- **Hot-seating** (a technique used to deepen an actor's understanding of a role. The individual sits in the 'hot seat' and has questions fired at them that they have to answer from the point of view of the role they are enacting)
- **Role-play** (an individual pretends to be someone else, by putting themselves in a similar position and imagining what that person might say, think and feel)
- **Cross-cutting** (creating a scene or scenes and then reordering the action by 'cutting' forwards and backwards to different moments)
- **Forum-theatre** (a scene is enacted and watched by the rest of the group. At any point in the drama, observers or actors can stop the action to ask for help or refocus the work. Observers can step in and add a role or take over an existing one)
- **Marking the moment** (having created a piece of drama work, individuals identify a significant moment in the piece. This can be done in discussion, marked by freezing the action, using captions, inner thoughts spoken out loud, using lighting to spotlight the moment, etc. The moment will represent significance for the individual in terms of revealing an understanding, an insight or evoking a feeling about the issue or idea being explored).

b The drama medium

- The use of costume, masks and/or makeup
- The use of sound and/or music
- The use of lighting
- The use of space and/or levels
- The use of set and/or props
- The use of movement, mime and/or gesture
- The use of voice
- The use of spoken language.

c The elements of drama

- **Action/Plot/Content** (the story, the characters, and/or the theme(s) of the drama)
- **Forms** (the way the story is told, the characters are portrayed and/or the themes are depicted)
- **Climax/Anti-climax** (building and/or releasing tension in the drama and/or a sense of expectation)
- **Rhythm/Pace/Tempo** (the rate at which the action moves along and the extent to which this changes)
- **Contrasts** (for example, stillness vs activity/silence vs noise)
- **Characterisation** (the means used to portray a role using vocal and physical skills)
- **Conventions** (using techniques such as slow motion, freeze-frame, audience asides, soliloquy, establishing one part of the space as one location and a different part of the space as another location)
- **Symbols** (the representational use of props, gestures, expressions, costume, lighting, and/or setting. For example, blue lighting to represent night-time, a white costume to represent the innocence of a character).

d Drama texts

In this unit a 'drama text' is defined as any suitable stimulus material to which students will respond and use as the starting point for their own drama work. Students might explore the material through drama in order to gain a deeper understanding of the meaning of the text itself or as a way of making sense of the world.

When selecting material for use in this unit, teachers must ensure that students are introduced to examples taken from across different times and cultures. The list below gives a range of different types of stimulus material with an example of each. The examples indicate ways in which differences in time and culture might be achieved when selecting material for this unit of coursework. These examples are indicative and are not prescribed.

- **Poetry** (*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* – Coleridge)
- **Artefacts: photographs, pictures, masks, props, costume, sculpture, object d'art** (an African mask)
- **Music** (South American pan-pipe music)
- **Play scripts** (*Statements* – Athol Fugard)
- **Live theatre performances** (Production of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*)
- **Television, films and/or videos** (An episode of *The Bill*)
- **Newspaper and/or magazine articles** (A facsimile edition of the front page of a 1939 *Daily Mirror*)
- **Extracts from literary fiction and/or non-fiction** (An extract from *Tom Sawyer* by Mark Twain).

During the programme of study, students will be introduced to:

- all of the (a) **exploration strategies** listed above
- each of the aspects that make up the (b) **medium of drama**
- all of the (c) **elements of drama** listed above
- at least one example of each of the types of stimulus material listed under the (d) **drama texts** section.

Assessment

For the assessment of this unit, students will be required to:

- select appropriate (a) exploration strategies
- use the (b) medium and (c) elements of drama effectively
- explore at least two different types of (d) drama texts representing different times and cultures.

Different times and cultures

For the purposes of this specification, different cultures are defined as different ethnic, religious and/or social groups. When responding to different drama texts, students need to be aware of their historical and cultural significance. Students should be able to recognise the similarities and/or differences between the texts they are responding to and reflect this in their work.

Assessment tasks

Each student must participate in a 'drama exploration workshop' lasting a total of approximately six hours and produce a 'portfolio of documentary evidence' consisting of a maximum of six sheets of A4 paper.

The workshop will:

- be based around at least two different types of drama texts selected from section (d) above. The material selected by the teacher must be from different times and cultures
- enable students to use at least four of the explorative strategies from section (a) above in their response to the material
- require students to use at least two of the skills areas listed above in the drama medium section (b)
- provide opportunities for students to select and use appropriately the elements of drama as identified above in section (c) in their responses to the stimulus material.

The portfolio will consist of the following:

TASK 1: The response phase (AO1)

Students should capture on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent) their response to the drama texts presented. This part of the portfolio will focus on the choice of (a) 'explorative strategies' and require students to explain how the use of these strategies enhanced their understanding and appreciation of the (d) drama texts being explored. It also requires students to make connections and comparisons between the different drama texts used as stimulus material.

TASK 2: The development phase (AO2)

Students should capture on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent) a section of the workshop that has been developed using (b) the drama medium and (c) the elements of drama. This part of the portfolio requires students to present the script for a scene or section of the work that has emerged during the workshop process. The script may be presented in a format appropriate to the context of the drama that has been developed. (For example: (a) dialogue with stage directions; (b) a storyboard of the scene; (c) in-role writing). In this part of the unit, students should be able to demonstrate that they can use the medium and elements of drama effectively.

TASK 3: The evaluative phase (AO4)

Students should provide an evaluation of the workshop on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent). The evaluation will be a reflection on the effectiveness of the whole learning process gained through the workshop. Students should evaluate the work of others in the group as well as their own contribution to the workshop. In the evaluation, students should recognise the significance of the social, cultural and/or historical influences on the drama texts and how these have affected their own drama work.

The portfolio should not exceed six sheets of A4 paper and may include sketches, diagrams and drawings. Students may use both sides of each sheet of A4 paper or replace any sheet of A4 paper with a sheet of A3. Only one side of A3 may be used. Students may use IT in the production of the portfolio, but teacher-assessors must be able to authenticate that it is the student's own and unaided work.

Unit 2: Drama exploration II

Study for this unit will include:

- interpreting a complete and substantial play text
- recognising the ways in which playwrights, directors, designers and/or performers communicate meaning through the medium of drama
- selecting appropriate elements of drama to interpret a complete and substantial play text
- gaining a practical understanding of the medium of drama through the exploration of a complete and substantial play text
- evaluating the effectiveness of different interpretations of a complete and substantial play text
- developing performing skills and rehearsal techniques
- developing and realising ideas in response to a play within a group
- using the language of drama to communicate ideas to others
- recognising the ways in which playwrights record their instructions in a script
- applying drama skills in the realisation of extracts from a complete and substantial play text
- approaches to developing a character and/or role
- exploring different staging methods
- understanding the social, cultural and historical context of a complete and substantial play text.

Content

In this coursework unit, the emphasis is on students developing an understanding of the ways in which playwrights record their ideas in a script and how performers, directors and designers use drama to interpret and realise these ideas in performance. Within this unit, the work is intended to have meaning for the participants and is not intended for performance to a theatre audience. The work produced for this unit may, however, be developed and used as the material for the performance support (option b) or scripted performance (option c) options in Paper 2 (Drama Performance). Part of the process of teaching this unit will include sharing work in progress with others and responding to constructive feedback.

Teachers will provide a programme of study that will:

- enable students to engage in a range of drama activities and apply them to a complete and substantial play text
- explore a complete and substantial play text that will engage the interest of students in terms of subject matter and the treatment of themes.

Students will be required to call upon their learning acquired during the programme of study in their response to the final assessment task.

Programme of study

The programme of study will introduce students to the following within the context of exploring a complete and substantial play text:

a Explorative strategies

- **Still image** (one person acts as a sculptor and creates images by positioning individuals in the group in relation to one another to create a still image)
- **Thought-tracking** (stopping individuals during an in-role activity and asking them to reveal their inner thoughts at a particular moment)
- **Narrating** (providing a spoken commentary that accompanies stage action, or a story being related by a character)
- **Hot-seating** (a technique used to deepen an actor's understanding of a role. The individual sits in the 'hot seat' and has questions fired at them that they have to answer from the point of view of the role they are enacting)
- **Role-play** (an individual pretends to be someone else, by putting themselves in a similar position and imagining what that person might say, think and feel)
- **Cross-cutting** (creating a scene or scenes and then reordering the action by 'cutting' forwards and backwards to different moments)
- **Forum-theatre** (a scene is enacted and watched by the rest of the group. At any point in the drama, observers or actors can stop the action to ask for help or refocus the work. Observers can step in and add a role or take over an existing one)
- **Marking the moment** (having created a piece of drama work, individuals identify a significant moment in the piece. This can be done in discussion, marked by freezing the action, using captions, inner thoughts spoken out loud, using lighting to spotlight the moment, etc. The moment will represent significance for the individual in terms of revealing an understanding, an insight or evoking a feeling about the issue or idea being explored).

b The drama medium

- The use of costume, masks and/or makeup
- The use of sound and/or music
- The use of lighting
- The use of space and/or levels
- The use of set and/or props
- The use of movement, mime and/or gesture
- The use of voice
- The use of spoken language.

c The elements of drama

- **Action/Plot/Content** (the story, the characters, and/or the theme(s) of the drama)
- **Forms** (the way the story is told, the characters are portrayed and/or the themes are depicted)
- **Climax/Anti-climax** (building and/or releasing tension in the drama and/or a sense of expectation)

- **Rhythm/Pace/Tempo** (the rate at which the action moves along and the extent to which this changes)
- **Contrasts** (for example, stillness vs activity/silence vs noise)
- **Characterisation** (the means used to portray a role using vocal and physical skills)
- **Conventions** (using techniques such as slow motion, freeze-frame, audience asides, soliloquy, establishing one part of the space as one location and a different part of the space as another location)
- **Symbols** (the representational use of props, gestures, expressions, costume, lighting, and/or setting. For example, blue lighting to represent night-time, a white costume to represent the innocence of a character).

(d) A complete and substantial play text

The play text chosen for this unit of coursework must meet all of the following criteria:

- a published play that has been performed by a professional theatre company
- a complete play with a running time of at least one hour
- a play with at least two characters/roles
- a play from a different time and/or culture from the drama texts used in Unit 1.

A list of 100 play texts is provided in *Appendix 4*. This list is intended to be indicative and is not prescriptive.

During the programme of study, students will be introduced to:

- all of the (a) exploration strategies listed above
- each of the aspects that make up the (b) medium of drama
- all of the (c) elements of drama listed above
- at least one complete and substantial play text that meets all of the criteria listed in section (d) above.

Assessment

For the purposes of assessment in Unit 2, students are required to apply the activities listed in the contents section to the context of exploring a play, whereas in Unit 1 the context relates to the structuring of their own drama work. A play can be the starting point for work in Unit 1, but it should be a different play from that explored in Unit 2. Part of the course of study must include either a visit to a live theatre performance or the opportunity to see other students performing a scene from a play in order to give students first-hand experience of theatre practitioners using the elements and the medium of drama.

For the assessment of this unit, students will be required to:

- select appropriate (a) exploration strategies
- use the (b) medium and (c) elements of drama effectively
- explore (d) a complete and substantial play text. (Within the time constraints of the workshop, it may only be possible to use selected scenes from the play chosen, but students must be able to relate the extracts to the play as a whole.)

Assessment tasks

Each student must participate in a 'drama exploration workshop' lasting a total of approximately six hours and produce a 'portfolio of documentary evidence' consisting of a maximum of six sheets of A4 paper.

The workshop will:

- be based around a complete and substantial play text as defined in section (d) above.
- enable students to use at least four of the explorative strategies from section (a) above in their response to sections of the play
- require students to use at least two of the skills areas listed above in the drama medium section (b)
- provide opportunities for students to select and use appropriately the elements of drama as identified above in section (c) in their responses to the play text being explored.

The portfolio will consist of the following:

TASK 1: The response phase (AO1)

Students should capture on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent) their response to the play text being explored. This part of the portfolio will focus on the choice of (a) 'explorative strategies' and require students to explain how the use of these strategies enhanced their understanding and appreciation of the play text being explored.

TASK 2: The development phase (AO2)

Students should capture on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent) the ways in which a section of the play that has been explored using (b) The drama medium and (c) the elements of drama. This part of the portfolio requires students to demonstrate their understanding and interpretation of a scene or section of the play that has emerged during the workshop process.

The work for this assessment task can be presented as a series of sketches, drawings, textual annotations, written statements and/or diagrams that aptly summarise the student's ideas for staging a scene or scenes from the play that have emerged during the workshop process.

TASK 3: The evaluative phase (AO4)

Students should provide an evaluation of the work of others based either on a play explored under workshop conditions or on a live performance of any play. The evaluation should be captured on a maximum of two sheets of A4 paper (ie four sides, 500 – 1,000 words equivalent). The evaluation will be a reflection on the effectiveness of the interpretation of a play seen under workshop or performance conditions. The work of others being evaluated can be of any play but the evaluation should reflect the students' understanding and appreciation of how others are using the medium and elements of drama. In the evaluation, students should recognise the significance of the social, cultural and/or historical influences on the play and/or the performance and be able to make connections and comparisons between written and performed texts.

The portfolio for Unit 2 should not exceed six sheets of A4 paper and may include sketches, diagrams and drawings. Students may use both sides of each sheet of A4 paper or replace any sheet of A4 paper with a sheet of A3. Only one side of A3 may be used. Students may use IT in the production of the portfolio, but teacher-assessors must be able to authenticate that it is the student's own and unaided work.

Marking and assessment procedures

The teacher will be the assessor for this paper. Teachers will use evidence from the student's practical work during each of the 'drama exploration workshops' and from the documentary evidence presented in the portfolio for each unit to arrive at an overall mark out of 120.

Unit 1 is marked out of 60 and Unit 2 is marked out of 60. The two marks must be added together to give a total mark out of 120. The mark out of 120 is the one submitted on the optically read teacher examiner mark sheet (OPTEMS).

Teachers will arrive at their final mark using the assessment criteria grid that follows.

Against each assessment objective there are three descriptors at each level:

- for AO1 and AO2, descriptors 1 and 2 apply to the practical demonstration of the outcomes
- for AO4, descriptor 1 applies to the practical demonstration of the outcome
- for AO1 and AO2, descriptor 3 applies to the portfolio evidence of the outcome
- for AO4, descriptors 2 and 3 apply to the portfolio evidence of the outcome.

It is recommended that teachers make a copy of the assessment grid for each student and use a highlighter pen to indicate which descriptors best describe the individual student's achievement. In order to award full marks at each level, all three descriptors would need to be highlighted. For example, if all three descriptors were highlighted in the 8-12 band, the student would be awarded a mark of 12. However, if descriptors 1 and 2 were highlighted in the 8-12 band and descriptor 3 was highlighted in the 13-16 band, the student would be awarded a mark of 13 or 14. Students may be in different bands against each of the three assessment objectives and different students may well arrive at similar marks but achieve them with a different balance of marks across the three assessment objectives.

Area standardisation meetings

All the teacher-assessors will be required to attend an Area Standardisation meeting in the autumn term of the year of student entry for this specification. The first Area Standardisation meeting for this specification will be between October and December 2002. At this meeting, teachers will mark video examples of practical work and the accompanying portfolio of documentary evidence in order to acquaint themselves with the standard of marking. Subsequent attendance at these meetings will only be required for new teacher-assessors or centres that have not met the standard of marking the previous year.

Where centres are unable to send a representative to an area standardisation meeting owing to unavoidable circumstances (namely illness), there are three alternative arrangements available.

The arrangements are in hierarchical order.

- 1 Attendance at a meeting on an alternative date held out of region
- 2 Attendance at a 'mop-up' meeting held in London in the January following the autumn round of meetings
- 3 Completion of a 'distance-learning' pack in the January following the autumn round of meetings.

Internal standardisation

Where more than one teacher is assessing students in a centre, one teacher must take responsibility for internal standardisation of the centre's marking. This must be the teacher who has attended the area standardisation meeting. The sample sent to the moderator should be made up of students from different teaching groups.

Edexcel reserves the right to check that internal standardisation has taken place and/or check the consistency of marking by appointing a moderator to visit a centre or by requesting further examples of assessed work.

Edexcel reserves the right to use anonymously examples of Paper 1 coursework for the purposes of moderator training, teacher-assessor training and in any teacher support materials.

Assessment evidence

Centres are required to submit the following assessment evidence and documentation to a moderator appointed by Edexcel. The date for submission will be notified separately.

No	Document	Description
1	A copy of the teacher's plan for the two 'drama exploration workshops'.	<p>A proforma (DRAM 1) is provided in <i>Appendix 6</i>.</p> <p>The plan should show the initial stimulus material (a play for Unit 2) being explored and the activities that the students have taken part in. It should also illustrate how the opportunity for the documentary evidence arose during the sessions.</p>
2	<p>A sample of student portfolios containing the Unit 1 and Unit 2 work.</p> <p>(These MUST be the same students for the two units of coursework.)</p>	<p>A front cover sheet (DRAM 2) is provided in <i>Appendix 7</i>.</p> <p>The sample must include the student with the lowest mark and the student with the highest mark. A minimum of 10 portfolios per centre will be required plus one portfolio for every 10 students up to a maximum of 20 portfolios.</p> <p>The portfolio should not exceed six sheets of A4 paper for Unit 1 and six sheets of A4 paper for Unit 2.</p>
3	<p>A video recording of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a 20 – 30 minute Unit 1 session and – a 20 – 30 minute Unit 2 session. 	<p>The video recording, which must be on VHS format, should be in long shot/wide angle and show students working on an activity or task in the lesson. The moderator will use the video recording to assess the general standard of work of the centre.</p>
4	A teacher comment sheet for the sample students.	<p>This is part of the cover sheet (DRAM 2) in <i>Appendix 7</i>.</p> <p>This should provide the moderator with a justification for the overall mark given using evidence from the practical sessions and the portfolio of documentary evidence.</p>
5	A copy of a completed OPTEMS for all students.	<p>This is the optically read teacher examiner mark sheet. The top copy is sent to Edexcel for processing, one copy is sent to the moderator and the centre retains a copy.</p>

Paper 2: Drama performance

40% externally assessed practical examination

Assessment focus:

Option a: Devised performance

Option b: Performance support

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of drama through:

- AO2 **developing** and exploring ideas using appropriate forms to structure them into a meaningful piece of drama work
- AO3 **presenting** ideas to others using the appropriate performing and/or production skills to communicate their intentions.

Option c: Scripted performance

Students will demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of drama through:

- AO3 **presenting** ideas to others using the appropriate performing and/or production skills to communicate their intentions.

Study for this paper will include:

- taking on the role of actor or designer within a performance group
- working collaboratively as members of a performance company
- interpreting a script or devising an original script
- rehearsing and staging a performance
- practising acting or theatre craft skills
- using drama skills to communicate to an audience.

Content

Students will draw on their learning about drama, which has taken place in Paper 1, to inform their performance work.

- In Paper 1, Unit 1, students have used drama form to explore ideas and issues. In Paper 2, students can develop this work to create a piece of devised theatre.
- In Paper 1, Unit 2, students have used drama form to explore a play and interpret it from the point of view of a practitioner of theatre. In Paper 2, students can develop this work by taking part in a production of some or all of the play to an audience and experience the play under performance conditions.

There are three options within this paper that reflect different contexts in which the assessment of performance work in drama can take place.

Option a: Devised performance

- This option enables students to be assessed through the performance of an original piece of drama that they have devised in a group of between **three and nine** students in a performance lasting between 15 minutes for smaller groups and 45 minutes for larger groups.
- This option also enables students to use a script as a starting point but to adapt it, to manipulate the text and to embellish it with their own ideas.
- Students are assessed on the way they have explored a role as manifest in the final performance (assessment objective AO2 – 20%) and on their use of performing skills to communicate their intentions to an audience (assessment objective AO3 – 20%).

Option b: Performance support

- This option enables students to be assessed through their application of a theatre craft (lighting, sound, costume, stage design, masks/makeup) within the performance of a devised or scripted play.
- Students must demonstrate their craft by keeping records of the design process and demonstrating the design in a performance.
- Students taking this option must be part of a performance company.
- Students are assessed on the way that they have explored and developed their ideas and how they have carried them through into a performance.
- Students are required to give a five-minute presentation to the visiting examiner to demonstrate the development of their ideas (assessment objective AO2 – 20%) and to present their completed artefact(s) under performance conditions (assessment objective AO3 – 20%).

Option c: Scripted performance

- This option enables students to be assessed through the performance of a role or roles within the production of a play or an extract from a play. The performance must take place within a group of between **three and nine** students and last between 15 minutes for smaller groups and 45 minutes for larger groups. The script can be amended and edited for performance, but the students are essentially interpreting existing material.
- Students are assessed on the way in which they use their acting skills to communicate their interpretation of a role to an audience (assessment objective AO3 – 40%).

Assessment tasks

For option a: Devised performance:

Students will develop a role or roles by responding to a stimulus (that can be an existing script that becomes significantly altered or transmogrified) and creating a piece of original drama. Students should be able communicate their role effectively to an audience.

- *Devised work should be 15 minutes in length for smaller groups and a maximum of 45 minutes in length for larger groups.*

- The group size should be between **three and nine** students.
- Students can work in larger groups than nine if additional students are working with them in a support role as part of option b.

For option b: Performance support:

Students will take on the responsibility of supporting a performance by providing stage design, costume, lighting, masks/makeup or sound. The examiner must see a demonstration of their theatre craft within the context of a performance.

- In addition students must present their ideas and documentary evidence to the examiner after the performance by giving a presentation lasting no more than five minutes.

For each theatre craft, students should provide the following:

i Costume

The student must provide:

- a portfolio of research and sketches showing the development of ideas
- the final design of **one** constructed costume
- drawings for at least **two** other characters in the play
- a costume plot or list of costumes/accessories worn by each actor
- a justification for other hired or found costumes used in the performance
- **one** constructed costume seen within the context of the performance.

ii Masks/makeup

The student must provide:

- a portfolio of research and sketches showing the development of ideas
- the final design for **one** mask or **two** makeups
- drawings for at least **two** other characters in the play
- a justification of the choice of materials, application methods (for makeup) and construction methods (for a mask)
- a demonstration of at least **one** mask or **two** makeups in performance conditions.

iii Stage design

The students must provide:

- a portfolio of research and sketches showing the development of ideas
- a 1:25 scale model of the final design to be realised in the performance space
- a justification for the final design decision
- a 1:25 scale ground plan and/or scale drawing of any designed properties
- the design (setting, properties) as realised within the context of the performance.

iv Lighting

The student must provide:

- a portfolio of research and sketches showing the development of ideas
- the final lighting design with grid plan and a lantern schedule

- a lighting plot or cue sheet showing at least **four** different lighting states
- a justification for the final lighting design
- a demonstration of the lighting plot within the context of the performance.

(Students will require access to at least a two pre-set manual board or they may use a computerised lighting desk.)

v Sound

The student must provide:

- notes listing the sound requirements of the performance
- a source sheet showing the creation of at least **one** original sound effect and the source of the remaining cues (eg CD title and number; MIDI file from the internet)
- a cue sheet showing the order, length and output level of each cue
- a justification for the choice of effects and/or music and their use
- the final 'sound tape(s)*' which should include at least **one** original cue which the student has created and recorded live and **three** further sound cues
- a demonstration of the sound operation within the context of the performance.

(* any appropriate sound reproduction medium may be used)

Particular attention needs to be paid to health and safety issues if students are undertaking any of the above theatre craft options.

For option c: scripted performance:

Students will take on a role within a scripted play. This could be a play explored in Paper 1.

- The play chosen should have a balance of roles within it for each student.
- The play performed can be a one-act play, an extract from a play or an adaptation of a play, *but for this option the intention is to remain faithful to the text. If the text is radically altered, students should be assessed under option (a) Devised performance.*
- The performance of the role should last about five minutes for each student within the context of a live performance.
- The minimum performance time should be 15 minutes for small groups, while larger groups of up to nine students could perform in a play lasting up to 45 minutes maximum.
- Students should be able to communicate their role effectively to an audience.
- *Teachers should give guidance on the students' choice of play.*
- Further guidance on the selection of plays is given in *Appendix 5*.

Marking and assessment procedures

A visiting examiner appointed by Edexcel will externally assess each student's contribution to a performance. The examination will take place between 1 March and 31 May, in the year of student entry, on a date mutually agreed between the centre and the visiting examiner. Whilst every effort will be made to provide an examiner on the date and time requested by centres, this is subject to the availability of visiting examiners. In exceptional circumstances, centres may be required to video record the performance for external assessment purposes.

REFERENCES

- Abbs, P. (1982) *English Within the Arts*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Abbs, P (1987) *Living Powers: the arts in education*, London, Falmer Press.
- Allen, J. (1979) *Drama in Schools: theory and practice*, London, Heinemann.
- Anderson, J. R. (1983) *The Architecture of Cognition*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Anning, A. (1988) Teachers' Theories about Children's Learning, in Calderhead, J. (ed), *Teachers' Professional Learning*, London, Falmer Press.
- Ball, S. J. and Bowe, J. (1992) Subject Departments and the 'implementation' of National Curriculum Policy: an overview of the issues, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, **24**(2), pp. 97-115.
- Beattie, D. K. (2000) Creativity in Art: the feasibility of assessing current conceptions in the school context, *Assessment in Education*, **7**(2), pp. 175-192.
- Bolster, A. S. (1983) Toward a More Effective Model of Research on Teaching, *Harvard Educational Review*, **53**, (pp. 294-308).
- Bolton, G. (1979) *Towards a Theory of Drama in Education*, London, Longman.
- Bolton, G. (1984) *Drama as Education: an argument for placing drama at the centre of the curriculum*, Harlow, Longman.
- Brown, A. L. and Ferrara, R. A. (1985) Diagnosing Zones of Proximal Development, in Wertsch, J. V. (ed) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, A. L. and Palincsar, A. S. (1985) Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Fostering and Monitoring Activities, in Wertsch, J. V. (ed) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A. and Duguid, P. (1989) Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning in *Educational Researcher*, **18**(1), pp. 32-42.
- Bruner, J. (1989) The Transactional Self, in Murphy, P. and Moon, B. (eds) *Developments in Learning and Assessment*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.

- Bullough, R.V., Knowles, J. G. and Crow, N. A. (1991) *Emerging as a Teacher*, London, Routledge.
- Burgess, R. and Gaundry, P. (1985) *Time for Drama, a handbook for secondary teachers*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Byron, K. (1986) *Drama in the English Classroom*, London, Methuen.
- Calderhead, J. (1988) The Contribution of Field Experiences to Student Primary Teachers' Professional Learning, *Research in Education*, **40**, pp. 33-49.
- Callaghan, J. (1976) Ruskin College Speech, 18th October 1976.
- Campbell, A. (1999) An Integrated Curriculum for English, Media and Drama at KS4 in *English in Education* 33(1) pp.13-23
- Chomsky, N. (1975) *Reflections on Language*, New York, Pantheon.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1986) *Classroom Practice: teacher images in action*, London, Falmer Press.
- Clark, J. and Goode, T. (1999), *Assessing Drama*, London, National Drama Publications.
- Cliff Hodges, G., Moss, J. and Shreeve, A. (2000) The Future of English in *English in Education* 34(1), pp 1-11. Sheffield, NATE.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994, 4th edn.) *Research Methods in Education*, London, Routledge.
- Collins, J. (1992) Drama in the English Classroom: could do better? In *2d*, 12(1), pp. 10-14
- Cornett, J. W. (1990) Teacher Thinking about Curriculum and Instruction: a case study of a secondary social studies teacher, *Theory and Research in Social Education*, **18**(3), pp. 248-273.
- Cropley, A. J. (2001) *Creativity in Education and Learning*, London, Kogan Page.
- Daugherty, R. (1997) Consistency in Teachers' Assessments: defining the problem, finding the answers, *British Journal of Curriculum and Assessment*, **8**(1), pp. 32-38.
- Department for Education. (1995) *English in the National Curriculum*, London, HMSO.
- DfEE/National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (1999) *All Our Futures: creativity, culture and education*, London.
- Doyle, W. and Ponder, G. A. (1977) The Practicality Ethic and Teacher Decision-Making, *Interchange*, **8**, pp. 1-12.

- Eggleston, J. (ed) (1979) *Teacher Decision-Making in the Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Elbaz, F. (1983) *Teacher Thinking: a study of practical knowledge*, London, Croom Helm.
- Elliott, J. (1991) *Action Research for Educational Change*, Milton Keynes, Open University,
- Fines, J. and Verrier, R. (1974) *The Drama of History: an experiment in co-operative teaching*, London, New University Press.
- Fleming, M. (1994) *Starting Drama Teaching*, London, David Fulton.
- Fleming, M. (1997) *The Art of Drama Teaching*, London, David Fulton.
- Fleming, M. (2000) Wittgenstein and the Teaching of Drama in *Research in Drama Education*, 5(1), pp 33-44.
- Fleming, M. (2001) *Teaching Drama in Primary and Secondary Schools: An integrated approach*. London, David Fulton.
- Forman, E. A. and Cazden, C. B. (1985) Exploring Vygotskian Perspectives in Education: the cognitive value of peer interaction, in Wertsch, J. V. (ed) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Franks, A. (1999) Where the Action is: How drama contributes to the art of the teaching and learning of English in *English in Education* 33(2) pp. 39-49.
- Freeman, D. (1991b) To Make the Tacit Explicit: teacher education, emerging discourse and conceptions of teaching, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(5/6), pp. 439-454.
- Freire, P. (1989) The Politics of Education in Murphy, P. and Moon, B. (eds) *Developments in Learning and Assessment*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Gall, M., Borg, W. and Gall, J. (1996, 6th edn.) *Educational Research: an introduction*, USA, Longman.
- Galton, M., Simon, B. and Croll, P. (1980) *Inside the Primary Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gardner, H. (1983) *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences* London, Fontana Press.
- Gipps, C.V. (1994) *Beyond Testing: towards a theory of educational assessment*, London, Falmer Press.

- Gipps, C.V. and Stobart, G. (1993) *Assessment. A teachers' guide to the issues*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Glaserfeld, E. (1989) Learning as a Constructive Activity in Murphy, M. and Moon, B. (eds) *Developments in Learning and Assessment*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Griffin, D. (1996) Drama: a broad and balanced curriculum. in *The English and Media Magazine*, **35**, Autumn, pp. 4-9.
- Grossman, P. (1987, April) *A Tale of Two Teachers: The role of subject matter orientation in teaching*, Paper presented at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
- Grossman, P. (1990) *The Making of a Teacher: teacher knowledge and teacher education*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- Gulbenkian Report (1982) *The Arts in Schools*, London, Culouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986) Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change, *Educational Researcher*, **15**(5), pp. 5-12.
- H.M.I. (1967) *The Plowden Report: children and their primary schools*, London, HMSO.
- H.M.I. (1988) *Curriculum Matters 17, drama from 5-16*, London, HMSO.
- H.M.I. (1968) *Drama Survey*, London, HMSO.
- Harland, J. (2000) *Arts Education in Secondary Schools: effects and effectiveness*. Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Harlen, W. and James, M. (1997) Assessment and Learning: differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment in *Assessment in Education*, **4**(3), pp. 365-379.
- Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L. and Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987, 2nd edn) *How To Measure Attitudes*, Newbury Park, California, Sage Publications.
- Hennessey, S. (1993) Situated Cognition and Cognitive Apprenticeship: implications for classroom learning, in *Studies in Science Education*, **1**(41), pp. 1-41.
- Herman, J. L. Klein, D. C. D. and Wakai, S. T. (1997) American Students' Perspectives on Alternative Assessment: do they know it's different?, in *Assessment in Education*, **4**(3), pp. 339-351.
- Hornbrook, D. (1989) *Education and Dramatic Art*, Oxford, Blackwell Educational.

- Hornbrook, D. (1991) *Education in Drama: casting the dramatic curriculum*, London, Heinemann.
- Hornbrook, D. (1996) The Challenge of Dramaturgy in *Research in Drama Education*, 1(1), pp. 87-93.
- Hoy, W. and Rees, R. (1977). The Bureaucratic Socialization of Student Teachers, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), pp. 23-26.
- Johnson, L. and O'Neill, C. (eds) (1984) *Dorothy Heathcote: collected writings on education and drama*, London, Hutchinson.
- Johnson, J. (1995) Can We Raise the Standards of Speaking and Listening? The Challenge of English in the National Curriculum, *The Use of English*. 50(1), p. 17.
- Kempe, A. (1999) Odd Bed-Fellows: A closer look at Gavin Bolton's four aims in teaching drama, *The Drama Magazine*, November, pp. 19-20.
- Kempe, A. and Nicholson, H. (2001) *Learning to Teach Drama 11-18*, New York, Continuum.
- Lacey, C. (1977) *The Socialization of Teachers*, London, Methuen.
- Lawlor, S. (1989) Correct Core, in Moon, B., Murphy, P. and Raynor, J. (eds) *Policies for the Curriculum*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Leinhardt, G. and Greeno, J. G. (1986) The Cognitive Skill of Teaching, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(2), pp. 75-79.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Beverly Hills, USA, Sage Publications.
- Lunt, I. (1993) The Practice of Assessment in Daniels, H. (ed) (1993) *Charting the Agenda: educational activity after Vygotsky*, London and New York, Routledge.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1993) Changes in Beliefs About Learners Among Participants in Eleven Teacher Education Programs, in Calderhead, J. and Gates, P. (eds) *Conceptualising Reflection in Teacher Development*, pp. 113-143, London, Falmer Press.
- McGuinn, N. (1995) What is Left of Drama and Media? In Protherough, R and King, P (eds) *The Challenge of English in the National Curriculum*, pp. 146-163, London, Routledge.
- McNamara, D. R. (1990) Research on Teachers' Thinking: its contribution to educating student teachers to think critically, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16(2), pp. 147-160.

- McNamara, D. R. (1991) Subject Knowledge and its Application: problems and possibilities for teacher educators, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, **17**(2), pp. 113-128.
- Marks, R. (1990) Pedagogical Content Knowledge from a Mathematical Case to a Modified Conception, *Journal of Teacher Education*, **41**(3), pp. 3-11.
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*, London, Sage Publications.
- Moll, L. C. (ed) (1990) *Vygotsky and Education: instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Morine-Dersheimer, G (1991b, April) *Tracing Conceptual Change in Pre-service Teachers*, Paper presented at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- National Curriculum Council (1989) *National Curriculum Council Consultation Report: English*, York, National Curriculum Council.
- Neelands, J. (1984) *Making Sense of Drama: a guide to classroom practice*, London, Heinemann.
- Neelands, J. (1992) *Learning Through Imagined Experience*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Nespor, J. (1992) The Role of Beliefs in the Practice of Teaching, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, **19**(4), pp. 317-328.
- Nuttall, D. (1989) The Validity of Assessment, in Murphy, P. and Moon, B. (eds) *Developments in Learning and Assessment*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- OFSTED (1993) *Handbook for the Inspection of Schools*, London, HMSO.
- OFSTED (1998) *Inspecting Subjects 3-11, Guidance for Inspectors*, London, HMSO.
- OFSTED (1999b) *Standards and Quality in Education 1997/1998* The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector for schools, London, OFSTED.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992) Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: cleaning up a messy construct, *Review of Educational Research*, **62**(3), pp. 307-332.
- Pavlov, I. P. (1927) *Conditioned Reflexes*, Translated by S. V. Anrep, Oxford University Press, London.

- Pearson, L. (1998) Standard English and Speaking and Listening: the speech of kings?, *The Use of English*, **50**(1), p. 14.
- Piaget, J. (1926) *Language and Thought of the Child*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Resnick L. (1989) Introduction in Resnick, L. (ed) (1989) *Knowing, Learning and Instruction: Essays in honour of R Glaser*, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richardson, V. (1995) The Consideration of Beliefs in Staff Development. in Richardson, V. (ed) *A Theory of Teacher Change and the Practice of Staff Development: a case in reading instruction*, New York, Teachers' College Press
- Rogoff, B. (1990) *Apprenticeship in Thinking*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Ross, M., Radnor, H., Mitchell, S. and Bierton, C. (1993) *Assessing Achievement in the Arts*, Buckingham, Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- Russell, T. (1988) From Pre-service Teacher Education to First Year of Teaching: a study of theory and practice, in Calderhead, J. (ed) *Teachers' Professional Learning*, London, Falmer Press.
- Russell, T. (1993) Critical Attributes of a Reflective Teacher: is agreement possible?, in Calderhead, J. and Gates, P. (ed) *Conceptualising Reflection in Teacher Development*, pp. 113-143, London, Falmer Press.
- Schon, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: how professionals think in action*, New York, Basic Books.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- Shavelson, R. J. (1973) What is the Basic Teaching Skill?, *Journal of Teacher Education*, **24**, pp. 144-151.
- Shepard, L. A. (1991) Psychometricians' Beliefs About Learning, *Educational Researcher* **20**(7), pp. 2-16.
- Short, R. J. and Short, P. M. (1989) Teacher Beliefs, Perceptions of Behavior Problems and Intervention Preferences, *Journal of Social Studies Research*, **13**(2), pp. 28-33.

- Shulman, L. S. (1986a) Paradigms and Research Programs in the Study of Teaching: a contemporary perspective, in Wittrock, M.C. (ed) *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd edn), pp. 3-36, New York, Macmillan.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986b) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching, *Educational Researcher*, **15**(2), pp. 4-14.
- Skinner, B. F. (1938) *The Behaviour of Organisms*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.
- Skinner, B. F. (1968) *The Technology of Teaching*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.
- Slade, P. (1954) *Child Drama*, London, University of London Press.
- Smith, D. C. and Neale, D. C. (1989) The Construction of Subject Matter Knowledge in Primary Science, *Teaching and Teacher Education* **5**(1), pp. 1-20.
- Snelbecker, G. E. (1974) *Learning Theory, Instructional Theory and Psychoeducational Design*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Sockett, H. (1987) Has Shulman got the Strategy Right?, *Harvard Educational Review*, **57**(2), pp. 208-219.
- Somers, J. (1996) Editorial in *Research in Drama Education* **1**(1), Oxford, Carfax.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, London, Heinemann.
- Stoddart, T. (1992, April) *Conceptual Change in Teacher Education*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Tolley, G. (1989) Learning and Assessment in Murphy, P. and Moon, B. (eds) *Developments in Learning and Assessment*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Torrance, H. (ed) (1995) *Evaluation of Authentic Assessment*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Treacher, V. (1989) *Classroom Issues in Assessment and Evaluation in the Arts*, Reading, Berkshire Local Education Authority.
- Valencia, S. (1998) *Literacy Portfolios in Action*, Fort Worth Texas, Harcourt Brace.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986) *Thought and Language*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, M.I.T. Press.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and Speech in *L. S. Vygotsky, Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 39-285, edited by Reuber, R. and Canton, S. translated by Minick, N., New York, Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in Society*, Cambridge Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Way, B. (1967) *Development Through Drama*. London, Longman.
- Wertsch, J. V. and Stone, A. (1979) The Concept of Internalization in Vygotsky's Account of the Genesis of Higher Mental Functions, in Wertsch, J. V. (ed) *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wilcox, S. K. Schram, P. Lappen, G. and Lanvier, P. (1990, April) *The Role of a Learning Community in Changing Preservice Teachers' Knowledge and Beliefs about Mathematics Education*, Paper presented at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- Wilson, S. M., and Wineberg, S. (1988) Peering at History Through Different Lenses: the role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history, *Teachers College Record*, **89**, pp. 525-539.
- Winne P. H., and Marx, R. W. (1977) Reconceptualizing Research on Teaching, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **69**, pp. 668-678.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953) *Philosophical Investigations*, Translated by Anscombe, G.E.M., Oxford, Blackwell.
- Woods, P. (ed) (1980) *Teacher Strategies: explorations in the sociology of the school*, London, Croom Helm.
- Wubbels, T. (1992) Taking Account of Student Teachers' Preconceptions, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, **8**(2), pp. 137-149.